DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 109 EA 005 394

TITLE	Proceedings of National Seminar on Year-Round Education.
INSTITUTION	Brevard County Board of Public Instruction, Titusville, Fla.; Florida State Dept. of Education, Tallahassee.; Florida Technological Univ., Orlando.
PUB DATE	Mar 71
NOTE	171p.; Speeches given before national seminar on year-round education (3rd, Cocoa Beach, Florida, March 24-26, 1971) Related documents are EA 005 392 and 393
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Case Studies; *Conference Reports; Curriculum Development; Educational Finance; Educational Legislation; Program Budgeting; *Program Design; Program Evaluation; School Calendars; School Schedules; *Year Round Schools

ABSTRACT

The conference was held to exchange updated information concerning alternatives to the traditional 9-month school year; question motives and methods relating to established and planned year-round programs; and identify problem areas in year-round school operations. Presented in chronological order are all the speeches given at the conference. Topics discussed include a history of and rationale for the year-round school, the types of year-round school programs, internal problems associated with a year-round school program, financial implications, the relation of the year-round school to the public, politics and year-round education, overhauling year-round education, and humane year-round schools. Much of the conference was devoted to an examination of specific year-round school programs. Descriptions of these case studies are included in the document, as well as an evaluation and a summary of the conference, a list of conference participants, and an evaluation questionnaire. (Photographs and xeroxed copy may reproduce poorly.) (Author/DN)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

AUG 31 1973

[redacted]

R. D. Means

EA

Proceedings of

3rd
NATIONAL SEMINAR
on
YEAR ROUND EDUCATION

ED 081109

MARCH 24-26, 1971

COCOA BEACH, FLORIDA

EA 005 394

Cooperating Agencies

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
FLORIDA TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
BREVARD COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FROM THE SUPERINTENDENT

On behalf of the Brevard County School District, host for the 3rd National Seminar on Year-Round Education, I would like to say what a pleasure it has been to have this Seminar in our County.

Here, within a few miles of America's spaceport where so many scientific innovations have taken place, it seems very appropriate to hold meetings on educational change. Just ten years ago, the very concept that man would one day travel to the moon was an idea beyond the belief of most "practical" individuals. Today, we can look forward to eventual trips to other planets.

We, as educators, have an obligation to continuously strive towards a better utilization of time and money to produce our end result. The attendance of 360 participants from 30 states, Canada, Guam, and Puerto Rico, plus local staff proves our continuing and vital interest in this goal.

Many of the ideas expressed here may take years to reach fruition. We in Brevard County know all too well that a single step here in the sand of Cocoa Beach may end up -- a decade later -- on the moon.

Perhaps some of the concepts developed at this meeting may someday have as far reaching an effect on American education as the blastoff of Apollo XI had on world science.

We hope you enjoyed yourself here. We certainly enjoyed meeting and sharing ideas with you at this important seminar.

Wayne H. White
WAYNE H. WHITE

PREFACE

The national educational scene reflects innovation with new instructional programs, new methods of teaching, and new forms of school organization.

Rising school enrollments, sky-rocketing construction costs, and a desire to find new ways to provide relevance in an ever changing instructional program have spurred interest in year-round education.

The purpose of the Third National Seminar on Year-round Education was to provide educators with an update on the various designs for year-round education and to provoke serious reconsideration of present approaches to Administration, curriculum, finance, and community relations. Forty-eight consultants ranging from political leaders and superintendents to teachers, students, and parents helped focus the Seminar on the total year-round movement.

It is the hope of the Seminar Staff and cooperating agencies --Florida Department of Education, Florida Technoligical University, and Brevard County School District--that this report will be helpful in improving the learning opportunities of children across the nation.

D. Weizenecker

R. DALE WEIZENECKER
Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE
TABLE OF CONTENTS

FIRST GENERAL SESSION (NEWCOMERS)

The Calendar--Underdeveloped Educational Resource 1a
Modern Extended School Year Programs--Thumbnail Sketch 2a
Where It All Begins--The Community 3a

FIRST GENERAL SESSION (OLDTIMERS)

Year-Round Schools: Phantasmagorical Carrot 4a

SECOND GENERAL SESSION

Internal Problems Associated With A Year-Round Program 5a
Overhaul Year-Round Education 6a
Financial Implications of Year-Round School 7a
Year-Round School and the Public (which is plural) 8a
Analysis: Work on a Solution 9a

MINI-SESSIONS

State Project in Dade County 10a
The Grand Forks Project 11a
A Feasibility Study in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan 12a
The St. Charles Project 13a
Northville Year-Round Project 14a
Sliding 4-Quarter Plan 15a
State Project in Bradford County 16a
State Project in Clay County 17a
The Port Huron Project 18a
Consultant Opinion 19a

THIRD GENERAL SESSION

Florida's State Government and Year-Round Education 20a
Politics and Year-Round Education--Keynote Address 21a

FOURTH GENERAL SESSION

Fulton County Plan 22a
Jefferson County Plan 23a
Secondary Student Reaction 24a
Principal, Teacher Reaction 25a

FIFTH GENERAL SESSION

Hayward Unified Plan 26a
Valley View 45-15 Plan 26d
Administrator, Student Reaction 27a
Principal, Parent Reaction 28a
Teacher, School Board Member Reaction 29a

SIXTH GENERAL SESSION

A Report: Pennsylvania One Year Later 30a
Humane Year-Round Schools 31a
CONSULTANTS
SEMINAR STAFF

THE CALENDAR:
UNDERDEVELOPED
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCE

George M. Jensen

Let me delineate very briefly several highlights of the rather lengthy history of the year-round school idea from the early 1900's up until about 1966 or so. In so doing I will expand the reference to one early trial of the idea at Aliquippa, Pa., because it was rather well documented and from it we can learn some lessons that are still relevant to current discussions and planning. I should state, however, that in my opinion, little of what has gone before is really pertinent to what we are discussing in this seminar.

I will construct a rationale, from the standpoint of an informed layman, to support the idea of the calendar as a most important but long neglected educational resource--a resource that up to now, because of the reluctance of the educational establishment to utilize it, has remained fallow and largely undeveloped.

To begin with, the idea of year-round school is not new. Many people, including a surprising number of those in the teaching fraternity, think of year-round school as a relatively new and, to some, disturbing idea. It has, in fact, been kicking around in education since the turn of the century.

Way back in the early 1800's a number of our cities operated their schools nearly year-round. Buffalo, Baltimore, Cincinnati, Chicago, and New York were among them. For one reason or another these systems gradually shortened their educational programs at the same time rural districts gradually extended their original 90 day school years. By the early part of the 20th century the school year, both urban and rural, stabilized at from 160 to 180 days or so, to what we now know as the nine-month school year.

A year-round program was employed, with a very limited purpose in mind, back in 1904 in Bluffton, Indiana. It would appear as if the sole object at that time was to avoid the necessity of building a new schoolhouse. This point, due to lact of adequate records, is debatable, as there is some evidence that Bluffton's program was merely a very primitive sort of "summer school" of short duration. Be that as it may, the fact is that this motive is still prevalent--most people's interest even today has been triggered by a classroom shortage. The impending problem of issuing more bonds to build more schoolhouses while those we now have stand empty and unused almost four months out of every 12 is causing many to consider year-round school as a solution. With school expenditures approaching stratospheric heights and building costs sky-rocketing as they are, this seems reason enough to most people to consider any plan to get better educational mileage out of our present school plant, equipment, and personnel. But there is much more logic to all-year education than that dealing exclusively in brick and mortar.

Sixty years ago Newark, New Jersey embarked on an all-year educational plan. It was inaugurated to lick a local problem--one posed by a student body comprised chiefly of the sons and daughters of immigrant parents whose mastery of the English language was faulty and incomplete to say the least. So, to meet the language and communication problem, Newark operated its schools the year around for a period of time during the teens and through the twenties. In this case most of the students actually attended classes for a full year with a relatively short vacation.

Research reveals other such programs, but the scope of their departures from traditional educational procedures and time tables were modest indeed and we can learn little from them.

The program at Aliquippa, Pa. from 1929 to 1938 had a limited objective. It strove to provide much needed classroom space without constructing more schoolhouses. In this it was completely successful. Also, it was operated long enough and was sufficiently well documented so that today we can profit by some of the other findings of the program.

The program did give better mileage from the school tax dollar in Aliquippa. It saved money. It proved that fewer teachers were required and that employing staff for year-round operations was no problem. It proved that academic achievement didn't fall off during the summer months even before air conditioning. It proved that there were no physical or mental health hazards involved for either teacher or student. It proved that the average daily attendance figure for the summer quarter was higher than for any other period. It proved that, in the case of the mandatory quarter system on which Aliquippa operated, far fewer students and their families were frustrated in vacation planning than had been expected.

At this same time the neighboring school system at Ambridge, Pa. was operating on much the same plan and for the same reason. Their experience produced much the same results. Both these programs were built around the mandatory, sequential attendance 4-quarter pattern in which three-fourths of the student body is always in attendance with the other one-fourth on leave or vacation.

I have previously mentioned that there is much more involved in present day considerations of all-year education than simply brick and mortar, as important as needed schoolhouse facilities may be. For example, there is overwhelming evidence that the curriculum at both the elementary as well as secondary level is woefully in need of up-dating. This is really important, is at the heart of our educational endeavor and must be done.

Teacher contracts are too inflexible and fail to meet the employment needs of vast numbers of those who are presently teaching and many well-qualified individuals who would like to teach if only there were some flexibility in the contract, timewise.

These are only two of a number of reasons for our giving thought to capitalizing upon the calendar as an educational resourse--that is by utilizing far more of it than we do now. Let me sketch for you in the next few minutes a rationale to undergird my contention that we simply must give our best efforts to the development of an all-year educational plan and make far better use of time as a resource.

Up to now, unfortunately, most school administrators to whom we must look for leadership have been more than willing to sidestep the matter of an up-dated school attendance pattern involving all-year education. It's easy to see why. The present plan of eight months "Go" and four months "Stop" is loaded with fringe benefits they are reluctant to lose through any year-round plan. For this reason and others, most of them have seen fit to stoutly defend the "status quo".

However, some of our schoolmen, the tradition busters, whose numbers are increasing and some of whom are with us at this seminar, have sensed the tremendous learning potential that exists in the presently unused portion of the calendar and are resolutely going about the job of restructuring our obsolete, early American school attendance pattern. There has as a result developed what is now a nationwide groundswell of professional and lay interest and desire to do something constructive in this area.

Is this interest well founded? When all factors are considered, does it really make sound educational sense? Most of the "studies" made recently have been very narrow in scope. They have been energized, as we have seen, by some local crisis, usually lack of space and related to defeated bond issues. Far too few of these investigations have been initiated in an attempt to genuinely buttress and improve the entire educational program while at the same time solving the space problem.

There are exciting possibilities offered by most of the plans now under consideration or in actual trial, including the sequential attendance 4-quarter plan, the tri-mester plan, the 12-4 and 9-3 (or 45-15) plan as well as the sliding 4-quarter plan.

1. Increased schoolroom capacity immediately available from existing facilities.
2. Flexibility of teacher employment contracts.
3. Financial considerations.
4. Curriculum opportunities.
5. Student benefits.
6. "Quality of Life" spin-offs.
7. Additional considerations.

All of the plans I have mentioned release classroom space at once. They make use of the classroom space that is now wasted because of our blind and stubborn adherence to our farm-oriented calendar which uses our nation's fantastic educational apparatus only about 2/3 of the time. Currently the country has a total pupil load of about 46,000,000 of whom some 300,000 are condemned to half-day sessions. If class size remained constant at today's average we could use any of these plans to eliminate the split session and still have room in present buildings for nearly 15 million more students each year.

Needless to say these proportions wouldn't work out just exactly this way in every school district due to the physical location of some segments of the districts population. However, any school system which establishes year-round scheduling of its students on a sequential attendance pattern would immediately gain from one-fourth to one-third more classroom space.

In connection with our 2nd point, flexibility of teacher contract, I submit that for a great number of our teachers the nine or ten month contract fails to satisfactorily meet their true employment needs. Take our men teachers, for example. The present contract leaves them idle and unpaid from two to three months every year. A very large number of them "piece out" their incomes by seeking any work they can find and seldom if ever does their resulting employment enable them to cash in on their educational qualifications. Most year-round plans would offer them a year's employment on an optional basis and thus eliminate the sorry spectacle of a man qualified to teach doing manual labor during the summer months so as to earn enough to support himself and his family.

How about the experienced teacher, man or woman, who is getting along in years and for whom the nine month schedule is a real chore? He has either to sign a nine or ten month contract or leave teaching entirely. The flexible all-year plans make it possible for a teacher to elect to sign a three months contract, six months contract, nine months contract or enjoy a full year of teaching with compensation in proportion. Such plans will tend to hold good people in the teaching ranks and for the first time would make of teaching a full time, full fledged profession in the eyes of the business and professional world.

What about the teacher who for one reason or another has left the ranks? Oftentimes such a person would like to teach part time but does not care for the uncertainties of substitute teaching. Many of these people would re-enter the ranks if they could sign up for three or perhaps a six month stint. There is a wealth of such teaching talent available.

While all this would meet the varying employment needs of the teacher far better than the present inflexible contract, there are yet additional benefits to the school system. In the first place school boards could be much more selective in their employment practices as fewer teachers are required. Such selectivity would go far toward the elimination of the practice of hiring just anyone to fill a given vacancy and then franking into the system for life, through tenure, inadequately qualified individuals.

In addition to this it would make the job of the school board easier and more effective in its dealings with organized teacher groups. For the first time teaching would be on a par with other professions and business and commercial enterprises when it comes to making compensation comparisons. The teachers have to live for 12 months each year and they want to be paid for 12 months in an amount equal to the compensation earned by others with the same or comparable educational backgrounds. This bone of contention can never be eliminated until we can offer teachers full time, year-round employment. In these days of stratospheric educational costs the public won't stand still for paying teachers a 12 month salary for nine months' work even if the teacher does spend some extra time in the school at non-teaching tasks.

Let me point out one additional factor. School administrators tell us that the fatherless household, of which we now have such a bountiful supply, has created a unique problem calling for many more male teachers in the classroom, especially in the elementary grades and in the inner city areas. This need can never in my opinion be adequately met other than through a year-round school plan which offers male teachers full time employment at full time compensation.

You are not likely to get much encouragement from most school administrators when you question them about the possible economics of year-round school operation. This in spite of the fact that the only full fledged year-round program run long enough to come up with some real answers did report some savings. Aliquippa, as we saw earlier, came up with some dollar savings as reported by an administrator who was there. Dr. John Letson, superintendent of Atlanta's schools, doesn't talk about savings as his program calls for optional attendance of the summer quarter and was set up on a basis which was designed to cost more. The annual additional cost was about $1.3 million more in the first year out of a budget of over $83 million, or a little over 1-1/2 per cent. But listen to this statement, and I quote Dr. Letson: "One very significant factor. Our (4th quarter--summer) enrollment has been heaviest in those underprivileged areas of Atlanta where the need is greatest. We are not in an experiment in Atlanta. We are in the midstream of a commitment that we believe has and will continue to make it possible for us to buy better education for more students for a smaller number of dollars." Is that not an economy? I think so.

The most apparent savings in year-round operation come in the areas of buying things to support your program. Real estate, schoolhouses, equipment such as desks, chairs, cafeteria equipment, shop equipment, business machines, including typewriters, adding machines, calculators, teaching machines, audio-visual units, busses, and on and on ad infinitum. The need for all of these things is reduced on the order of 20 to 30 per cent by the extended use of your facilities through year-round operations.

Every time you build a new schoolhouse it can be 25 per cent smaller than under the 9 months school year, and this goes for all the things in it. What now costs $1 million to do your job can cost only $750,000 and get the same, perhaps better, educational result. And here's another angle. Build a $1 million schoolhouse today and finance the bonds over a 30 year period and what is the final cost to the community? $2 million. Under a year-round plan the schoolhouse cost of $750,000 paid off over 30 years is $1.5 million. That's a $500,000 saving to the district. Right?

Every time you take an acre of ground off the tax rolls you cost the community what that property would yield in real estate taxes. On a year-round program you'll need to buy or condemn 25 per cent less property in the future. At your own tax rate, figure what year-round operation will save the community in 10, 20, or 30 years. Every square foot of land removed from the tax rolls represents a cost to the community in uncollected taxes. This cost gets greater as the land values increase and it never stops mounting while the property is dedicated to school use. Most schoolmen and board members tend to ignore this phase of the problem.

One more thought in this area of finance and possible savings. It has to do with teachers. Don't expect any significant economies in your professional payroll, but don't expect any increases either except as bargaining increases the teachers' salaries. Aliquippa proved that an efficiently organized year-round program requires fewer full-time teaching stations--they dropped from 69 to 57, remember? Well, the 57 received extra compensation for the longer period of employment and most studies show an even-stephen outcome on professional salaries.

Don't overlook the possibility of saving some money on teacher retirement costs. The object of all teacher retirement plans is to provide adequate full-time retirement benefits to recipients who have been on the job only eight or nine months during their period of employment. This is a costly process both to the teacher and to the community underwriting such plans. With full-time employment offered, only those teachers electing to carry a full-time teaching load would receive maximum retirement benefits. All others choosing lighter teaching loads would receive lower although comparable benefits. Sizable retirement plan cost reductions are therefore possible as we move into a year-round operation. Don't fall into the error of overlooking this. It represents important money. There are nearly $20 billion ear-marked for teacher retirement plans around the country. Although part of that sum represents the teachers' contribution, most of it is yours.

The opportunity to restructure the curriculum is one of the main reasons for moving into a year-round program. Most year-round school plans invite, and some demand, a complete or at the very least a substantial restructuring of the present curriculum to make it more flexible, effective and relevant to our rapidly changing society. The re-evaluation of the total school program, as Atlanta's new year-round schedule at the secondary level is now dramatically demonstrating, will result in a more effective use of our presently established capacity to teach.

A spin-off benefit of curriculum up-dating would result from the necessity of splitting subject matter into shorter segments. The cost to the system in dollars and to the student in time lost as a result of subject failure would be less in both cases. The adverse psychological impact on the student would be ameliorated to a degree. Since enthusiasm for and interest in a subject are highest at the beginning and near the end of a course shorter, sharper "doses" of curriculum content could be more effectively taught. Boredom and consequent classroom disruption would certainly be much reduced.

The benefits to the student resulting from a move to year-round operation are truly exciting to consider. Right from the first day of school he will be better off. He will be able to enter school not once a year in September as at present, but four times, under a quarter system, for example. Any year-round operation, encompassing sequential or phased attendance plans, will elminate the once-a-year admittance policy that now is responsible for so much pupil maladjustment. The inflexible once-a-year admittance policy might have been satisfactory for yesterday's unsophisticated small fry, but it's murder with today's worldly wise, TV trained pre-schoolers. Under most year-round plans a child would enter school at the beginning of the period nearest his school entrance qualifying birthday. He would not be kept "on ice" for many months as the result of the accident of his date of birth. This matter is, incidentally, specifically covered in the year-round school permissive legislation now before the New York State Legislative. We believe this particular advantage of these new plans would also be of great aid to the teacher through reducing the wide gap in intellectual development that currently exists in the early grade levels.

Another benefit to the student right from the start of his formal education would be a more frequent change in teachers. Should he experience a personality conflict with his instructor it would not be, as it is in most cases at present, of a full school year's duration. In other words he wouldn't be "locked in" to an unproductive situation for such a long time. This has a reverse benefit also, which applies to the teacher.

As the student progressed he would benefit by the new curriculum with its shorter, more flexible subject content. At the high school level he'd find a far more interesting array of subjects from which to choose. If he selected an unsuitable subject, the time wasted with it would not be as long and costly to both him and the school system.

To the youth who is interested in a vacation job, the employment opportunities would be far better than at present. Now we flood the youth employment market with prospective job hunters in June, July, and August, few of whom can find work. Most all year plans, especially the four-quarter operation, would have youthful job hunters in the market all year long, thus meeting the labor needs of business and industry far better than at present.

Through their stubborn adherence to a timetable of yesteryear, our schools are keeping us locked in to a vacation schedule that no longer meets the requirements of an affluent society in the field of recreation and travel. At the same time it forces into idleness, borefom and frustration for the three summer months each year the sons and daughters of the underprivileged who don't know what a vacation is because they've never experienced one. This idleness, boredom, and frustration is an open invitation to mischief, vandalism, and general delinquency. A program of sequencing the vacation periods around the calendar would result in only a portion of these children being out from under the stabilizing influence of school at any one time. This would present our youth service groups an opportunity to restructure their activities so that with smaller full-time staffs they could do a real productive job with these underprivileged youth.

A sequencing of vacation periods would go a long way toward reducing the "people pressure" during June, July, and August on the nation's highways, lakes and streams, resorts, and recreational areas. Rotating vacation schedules would have the effect of more than doubling the capacity of national, state, and community parks and recreation areas without adding a single acre of land. It would also have the effect of recognizing the changing pattern of vacation and recreation and travel activities which today are truly year-round and are no longer confined to the summer months. This single aspect of the school calendar should give educators and others who oppose this change real cause for reflection as most certainly failure to implement it will result in a missed opportunity to enhance the rapidly dwindling quality of life in these important areas of living.

Although there are many other considerations which would tend to validate the move toward all-year education, one I cannot ignore, and that is the importance of community involvement in school affairs. It is absolutely vital to a viable, effective, and satisfying local educational program. Presenting the all-year education idea to a community presents a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to include everybody in the act. We must bring the public into our councils--and here is the chance to do it because we need the fresh air of opinion unhobbled by tradition or beholden to sacred cows.

Public consideration of this program gives the school board and the administration the opportunity, for once, to seek the help of every segment of the community without the onus of asking for more funds.

MODERN EXTENDED SCHOOL YEAR PROGRAMS--THUMBNAIL SKETCH

George B. Glinke

In discussing the movement of the year-round education concept in America during the past five years, I would like to point out that many school districts and states have become involved. Many professional associations and various college educators have studied the extended school movement.

It is indeed encouraging to see the rapid rise in the number of public schools (three in 1966 to 50 during the 1969-70 period) and state departments of public instruction (from three in 1966 to over 15 in 1970) involved in the extended school year movement.

The actual number of pilot, extended school year educational programs increased from zero in 1966 to over eight in operation in 1970 with another eight or more projected pilot concepts scheduled for implementation across the country.

One item which becomes very clear, as involved with the year-round educational movement, is that the concept has moved from the theoritical stage on the college campus to the local public school district for eventual implementation. This has to be the breakthrough the movement has been waiting for. With the changing of state educational codes, the movement will leap ahead with rapid gain.

The movement is gaining momentum. I feel it will sweep the country during the next ten years. Educators look at the concept as a tool to restructure curriculum, taxpayers see better utilization of tax supported buildings and school people see better teaching-learning situations emerging from the concept. It offers opportunities for enrichment, make-up, acceleration, increased family vacation flexibility and is much more in step to our urbanized pattern of living.

The basic reasons for conducting any pilot programs are two-fold: (1) to accurately test the actual economic feasibility at operation with the extended school year (the year-round educational movement), and (2) to determine if people will sociologically alter their basic traditional vacation patterns to provide year-round extended school operation.

These two answers do not appear in any feasibility report; it can only emerge from actual pilot operations. The spinoff in restructuring curriculum will improve the basic educational patterns and pave the way for new innovative techniques of learning.

Many, many school districts are restructuring their curriculum into new shorter units. Nine-, ten-, and twelve-week units appear to be more popular at this time.

Any district moving to a year-round educational program without careful and adequate preparation is subject to possible failure and, thus, subsequently destroy the year-round educational movement which has developed in this country.

In 1966 research indicates three new local school districts looking at the feasibility of year-round schools. One county study was reported with no evidence of new pilot programs. At the same time, three state studies were reported; California, Florida, and New York.

In 1967 five new local school districts reported looking at year-round school, but no other new activity was found in the research.

In 1968 Delaware, Illinois, and North Carolina joined the other three states listed and sixteen new local school districts were looking at the extended school year concept. Atlanta and Fulton County, Georgia, along with Hayward, California, were reported moving toward pilot programs.

In 1969 Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Missouri joined previous states in researching year-round schools, along with twenty-three new local school districts across America. They were all researching the feasibility of the extended school year. New pilots by this time included Lockport, Illinois and the Becky-David School in St. Charles, Missouri. This was also the first year of our national seminar in Fayetteville, Arkansas with state conferences being held in Florida, Michigan, and other states.

1970 finds a total of at least fifteen states; California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New York, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, Wisconsin, and Washington; several counties and twenty-seven new school districts looking at the possibility of year-round schools. Dade County, Florida established a pilot program and the Second National Seminar was held in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. Several other state conferences were also held.

As the extended school year movement gains momentum, new pilots will appear as states begin accepting the concept as a means to improve traditional educational programs in various areas across America.

1966

STATE STUDIES

1. State of California	Conducted a study of year-round operation of their state colleges
2. Florida Educational Research and Development Council	Conducted a feasibility study
3. State Department of New York State	Published Setting the Stage for the Lengthened School Year. This was to become the Bible for the extended school year movement.
4. University of Toledo	Conducted an economic analysis

LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

1. Harper Creek, Michigan	Feasibility study
2. L'Anse Cruese, Michigan	Feasibility study
3. Rockford, Illinois	Feasibility study

COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

1. Polk County, Florida	Feasibility study

PILOT PROGRAMS

1. San Jose, California	Was to conduct an experimental pilot at Del Campo. Lack of interest on part of students was reason given for not getting off the ground.

1967

STATE-WIDE STUDIES

none reported

LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

1. Findlay, Ohio	Conducted a feasibility study
2. Fraser, Michigan	Studied the possibility of extending the school year
3. Warren, Michigan	Feasibility study (again in 1970)
4. Detroit, Michigan	Feasibility study
5. Houston, Texas	Feasibility study

COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

none reported

PILOT PROGRAMS

none reported

NATIONAL POLLS

1. The Callup Poll	Conducted an "opinion" survey of parents

1968

STATE STUDIES

1. State of Delaware	Conducted a feasibility study for a rescheduled school year
2. Governor's Study Commission on the Public School System in North Carolina	Contained a portion about year-round schools

LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

1. Anaheim, California	Feasibility study
2. Avondale, Michigan	Feasibility study
3. Bloomfield Hills, Michigan	Feasibility study
4. Cincinnati, Ohio	Feasibility study
5. Durand, Michigan	Feasibility study
6. Edwardsburg, Michigan	Feasibility study

7.	Findlay, Ohio	Feasibility study
8.	Louisville, Kentucky	Feasibility study
9.	Plymouth, Michigan	Feasibility study
10.	Portage, Michigan	Feasibility study
11.	Rochester, Michigan	Feasibility study
12.	Rockford, Michigan	Feasibility study
13.	Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan	Feasibility study
14.	Seattle, Washington	Feasibility study
15.	Traverse City, Michigan	Feasibility study
16.	Utica, Michigan	The Michigan State University Study

COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

1.	Cook County, Illinois	Feasibility study

PILOT PROGRAMS

1.	Atlanta and Fulton County, Georgia	Started a modified four-quarter plan in September, 1968 (optional four-quarter)
2.	Hayward, California	Park Elementary School 222-day quadrimester is currently in operation
3.	Green Chimneys, N.Y.	Opportunity for summer program

NATIONAL SURVEY

1.	National Survey of public "classroom" teachers	Indicated emotional reaction regarding year-round education

1969

STATE STUDIES

1.	Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction	Feasibility study
2.	Southwestern Ohio Educational Research Council	Two cooperative study of the all-year school

LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

1.	Ann Arbor, Michigan	Feasibility study
2.	Denver, Colorado	Looking hard at extended school year
3.	East Lansing, Michigan	Feasibility study
4.	Freeland, Michigan	Feasibility study
5.	Hansdale, New York	Feasibility study
6.	Syosset, New York	Feasibility study
7.	Hartford, Connecticut	Feasibility study
8.	Knoxville, Tennessee	Feasibility study
9.	Lawrence, Texas	Feasibility study
10.	Lansing-Okemos-Haslett, Michigan	Feasibility study
11.	Lockport, Illinois	Valley View 45-15 (to be started fall, 1970)

12.	Ludlow, Vermont	Feasibility study
13.	Muskegon, Michigan	Feasibility study
14.	Northville, Michigan	Feasibility study
15.	Oil City, Pennsylvania	Feasibility study
16.	Omaha, Nebraska	Superintendent Calendar Committee Report
17.	Port Huron, Michigan	Feasibility study
18.	Portage, Michigan	Extended school year report to Board of Education
19.	Racine, Wisconsin	Feasibility study
20.	Rockville, Maryland	Feasibility study
21.	Roseville, Michigan	Feasibility study
22.	Utica, Michigan	Feasibility study
23.	Waterford Township, Michigan	Feasibility study

COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

none reported

PILOT PROGRAMS

1.	Atlanta, Georgia and Fulton County, Georgia	1,200 students in 1-6 periods, no charge
2.	Lockport, Illinois	Valley View (operational 45-15 now moving forward)
3.	Brooklyn, New York	John Dewey High School
4.	Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools	Third grade class
5.	Becky-David School, St. Charles County, Missouri	Elementary 45-15 plan
6.	Wilson School, Mankato State College	School (K-12) open all year, pupils can vacation whenever they wish
7.	See Hayward, California	

PLANNED PILOTS

1.	Englewood, Colorado	Cherry Creek Schools 5-year phase in 1969 (a practical plan will emerge) Plant - 90% Staff - hope to be 100% year-round in four years Community use - extensive Student attendance - when teachers become phased in, students will follow
2.	P. K. Yonge Laboratory School, University of Florida	Plan for flexible all year school
3.	Grand Forks, North Dakota	Plan delayed due to parent reaction at this time

4.	Butler, Pennsylvania	Has comprehensive summer program, considering ideas on year-round education
5.	Oil City, Pennsylvania	12-month contract for teachers, discontinued for financial reasons

NATIONAL SURVEY

1.	Nation's Schools	In 1969 an opinion poll of a four per cent proportional sampling of 16,000 administrators in 50 states concerning the need for an extended school year. Results: 32% responded affirmatively, 20% responded negatively, and 48% saw the extended school year as a future possibility. (The two plans most frequently suggested were the rotating four-quarter plan and the extended school year to 210 or more days.)
2.	National Education Association Task Force on Urban Education	Report on year-round school

NATIONAL YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION SEMINAR

1.	Fayetteville, Arkansas	Mt. Sequoyah National Seminar on Year-Round Education

STATE CONFERENCE

1.	Tallahassee, Florida	Extended School Year Conference

1970

STATE STUDIES

1.	California	Feasibility study
2.	Colorado	Feasibility study
3.	Florida	Running out front in providing funds for pilot projects
4.	Georgia	Studying results of pilot areas--a leader in the movement
5.	Illinois	Feasibility study
6.	Kentucky	Feasibility study
7.	Massachusetts	Getting material together for legislative action
8.	Michigan	Feasibility study. Looking hard at providing monies for pilot programs
9.	Minnesota	Feasibility study
10.	Missouri	Feasibility study
11.	Ohio	Feasibility study

12.	Pennsylvania	Moving ahead very rapidly. Have adopted preliminary rules and regulations.
13.	South Carolina	Eight weeks summer session attended by 30,000 students and moving towards extended school year
14.	Wisconsin	One pilot program. Requesting state funds to move forward
15.	Washington	Gathering material

LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

1.	Anchorage, Alaska	Feasibility study
2.	Berwyn, Pennsylvania	Expanded summer school offerings
3.	Battle Creek, Michigan (Harper Creek Schools)	Feasibility study
4.	Burlington, Iowa	Feasibility study
5.	Cohasset, Massachusetts	Feasibility study
6.	Centerline, Michigan	Feasibility study
7.	Dalton, Massachusetts	Feasibility study
8.	Danbury, Connecticut	Feasibility study
9.	Fayetteville, Arkansas	Looking again at extended school year
10.	Ipswich, Massachusetts	Feasibility study
11.	Kankakee, Illinois	Feasibility study
12.	Lakeside, California	Lakeside Union School District, feasibility study
13.	Lakewood, Colorado	Jefferson County, feasibility study
14.	Manassas, Virginia	County School Board, Prince William County, feasibility study
15.	Marysville, Michigan	Feasibility study
16.	Minneapolis, Minnesota	Wayzota School District is considering the 45-15 cycle pattern
17.	Omaha, Nebraska	Feasibility study
18.	Pontiac, Michigan	Concerned parents are looking at this concept
19.	Richmond, Vermont	Feasibility study
20.	San Antonio, Texas	Looking hard at year-round school
21.	San Diego, California	Moving toward a pilot program
22.	Saskatoon, Canada	Feasibility study
23.	Seattle, Washington	Teachers association is looking at year-round school
24.	St. Clair Shores, Michigan	Lakeview High School is looking at year-round school
25.	Tucson, Arizona	Looking at the movement
26.	Tulsa, Oklahoma	Moving to extend the school year
27.	Ukiah, California	Feasibility study

COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

1. Allegheny County, Pennsylvania	North Allegheny School District (Gemini 220 study)
2. Jefferson County, Kentucky	Will implement within two years (optional four-quarter, looking briefly at the optional five-term)

ACTUAL PILOTS

1. St. Charles County, Missouri	Becky-David School (45-14 plan)
2. Dade County, Florida	Quinmester

PLANNING PILOTS AND/OR HAVE/OR HOPE TO CONVERT CURRICULUM

1. Cincinnati, Ohio	45-day term curriculum plan
2. Okemos, Haslett and East Lansing, Michigan	Pilot program in 1972 or 1973
3. Utica, Michigan	Hopes to pilot in 1972 or 1973

NEW INTEREST FROM

1. Educational Administrative Graduate Classes	All across the country

NATIONAL SEMINARS

1. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania	Second Annual National Seminar

STATE CONFERENCES

1. Colorado
2. Michigan

A thumbnail sketch of forty types of proposed extended school year plans will enable both the old and the new in the year-round educational movement to understand more clearly that type of plan under discussion.

The mandated (forced) concept stands opposite to the optional approach. While more savings can come about with the forced concept (fuller utilization of public school buildings), the optional approach offers the same opportunity to restructure traditional curriculum. The optional concept gives families the choice as to whether or not to alter basic vacation patterns. If a district is out to save a great deal of money, you should double session your students. This enables you to automatically increase building use by 100 per cent. If improving local educational opportunities is the major goal of the educational community, restructure your curriculum. Develop a pilot program which best meets your local needs and run it as an optional plan for three four years.

This pilot program will test: (1) the absolute economic feasibility of year-round operation, and (2) the sociological acceptance of families altering their basic vacation patterns.

To get involved in the year-round educational movement, develop a Citizens Advisory Committee, conduct a feasibility study, choose an acceptable local plan, communicate it to your residents, restructure your traditional curriculum to meet the new structure and establish the pilot program. Once you have completed these six steps, you will have the answer you need about expanding the school year in your local community.

The majority of the attached plans can be utilized on either an optional or mandated approach. The rotated schedule appears to be compatible with the mandated approach, while the staggered concept appears to fit the optional plan closer.

According to an analysis of these more common plans, even number of weeks out number the odd week plans nearly two to one. Eight-, twelve-, and sixteen-week plans comprise the majority of even week schedules, while nine-week units comprise the vast majority of odd-week schedules.

When school districts develop more sophisticated individualized learning plans, such as multiple trails and ungraded elementary approaches, the number of weeks in an organized plan appears to be less important. As far as curriculum development is concerned, the length of the unit which best meets the need of local curriculum structure appears to be most satisfactory to those parties concerned.

The three most popular plans, optional or mandated, involve the eight-, nine-, and twelve-week units, such as:

1. The 40-Day (Eight-Week) Concept
   The student attends five of six sessions--200 days. (Rotating Split Trimester)
2. The 45-Day (Nine-Week) Concept
   The student attends four of five sessions--180 days. (Term Approach)
3. The 60-Day (Twelve-Week) Concept
   You attend three of our sessions--180 days. (Quarter Approach)

Now for a quick look at other concepts.

OTHER COMMON YEAR-ROUND EDUCATIONAL PLANS

1. Continuous Four-Quarter (see Rotated Four-Quarter Plan, nos. 18, 19, 20 or 27) Mandated program where pupil attends three of four quarters, schools operate year round.

2. Continuous Progress (see nos. 3, 4, 8 or 23) Multiple Trails accelerated concept. Pupil progresses at ability level, would attend school in excess of 200 days per year and graduate early.

3. Continuous Progress (See Multiple Trails, nos. 2, 4, 8 or 23)

4. Continuous Session (see Continuous Progress or Multiple Trails Plan, nos. 2, 3, 8 or 23)

5. Continuous 16-Week Trimester
   An accelerated program designed to save one year in seven, ten years in 13. Pupils attend school three 16-17 week sessions (48 weeks per year).

6. Double Session - Extended School Year
   Shorten the school day, double session and lengthen the school year.

7. Eight Weeks On, Two Weeks Off
   Eight weeks in school, two weeks off. Could be staggered, mandated or optional.

8. Extended K-12 Plan (see Continuous Learning Patterns, nos. 2, 3, 4, or 23)

9. Extended School day
   Increase the school day to give students extra classes.

10. Expanded Summer Program
    Develop a new 6-, 7-, 8-week summer program to enrich or make-up back learning situations.

11. Five-Semester (Mandated) (see Quinmester or Five-Term Mandated, nos. 12, 13 or 26)

12. Five-Semester (Optional) (See Term Optional, nos. 11, 13 or 26)

13. Five-Term (Mandated) (see Quinmesters, nos. 11, 12 or 26)
    Pupils attend four of five nine-week sessions on a rotation basis.

14. Five-Term (Optional)
    Pupils attend four of five nine-week terms on an optional basis. The family decides when the children shall be in school.

15. Forty-Five, Fifteen Plan
    Nine weeks in school, three weeks out. Can be rotated, staggered or full attendance.

16. Forty-Eight Five-Quarter
    Attends four 12-week sessions and drops out one 12-week session.

17. Four Days On, One Day Off
    Students alter their schedule by attending four days with one day off each week.

18. Four-Term (see Quadrimester Plan)
    New structured curriculum from two 90-day semesters to four 45-day terms. Pupils attend all four (doubles flexibility of student scheduling).

19. Four-Quarter (see nos. 20, 21 or 28)
    Calendar broken into 60-day (12-week) units. Students attend three of four (could be optional or mandated).

20. Four-Quarter (Optional) (see Four-Quarter, nos. 19, 21 or 28)

21. Four-Quarter (Mandated) (see nos. 19, 21 or 28)

22. Four Weeks On, One Week Off
Similar to three weeks on, one week off. Rotated school calendar.

23. Multiple Trails Plan (see Continuous Progress Plan, nos. 2, 3, 4, 8 or 23)

24. Nine-Three Concept (see Forty-Five, Fifteen Plan, no. 15)
Nine weeks on, three weeks off (can be staggered, rotated or full attendance).

25. Optional Split Trimester
This is six eight-week units. A pupil attends five of six-week units (40 weeks).
Could be optional or mandated.

26. Quadrimester Hour Plan (see Extended School Year Double Sessions, no. 6)
Extended school plan, half day sessions extended to 225 days. Four hours for 225 days instead of five hours for 180 days (could also mean five 45-day terms, (see nos. 11, 12 or 13).

27. Quadrimester Plan
Five 45-day periods. Students attend four of five (can be mandated or optional).

28. Rotating Four-Quarter (see Four-Quarter, nos. 18, 19, 20 or 21)
Could be optional or mandated.

29. Rotating Semi-Semester (Four 9-3 Sessions)
Four 12-week sessions, where students attend school nine weeks on and vacation three weeks off. Four 12-week (9 plus 3) units.

30. Rotating Trimester
Students attend two of three 75-day semesters (15 weeks). Would have longer class periods or lengthened school days to provide minimum experience.

31. Rotating Twelve-One Plan
Students attend three of four 12-week sessions and everybody has one week off vacation together after each 12-week term.

32. Rotating Twelve-Four Plan
Students attend three of four 12-week sessions with fours weeks off for all, each semester.

33. Six Semester (see Optional Split Trimester, no. 25)

34. Six Quarters On, Two Off
Students attend 72 weeks of school, and take a sabbatical leave type vacation for 24 weeks.

35. Ten-Three Plan
Ten weeks in school followed by three weeks vacation.

36. Three Block - Three Term Plan
Three 13-week blocks separated by a four-week block.

37. Three Weeks On, One Week Off
Students attend three weeks on, take one week off. Curriculum is a vast series of nine three-week classes.

38. Tri Twelve-Four Plan
Each third equals 12 weeks on, four weeks off. Pupil attends 36 weeks and is off 12 weeks each year.

39. Twenty-Six Plan
Twenty weeks in school with a six-week vacation.

40. Two Hundred-Ten Day Year
Extended regular school year which enables additional learning situations.

THE COMMUNITY WHERE IT ALL BEGINS

Dr. Oz Johnson

What is involved in the implementation of a year-round program of education? Let me outline the scenario used by the Jefferson County School System to arrive at a decision that it should depart from the time-honored 180-day school calendar. This scenario will show the entrances and exits of individuals and groups who were instrumental in bringing about a dramatic decision regarding what the school calendar of the future will be in Jefferson County.

For all practical purposes the play began in November 1968, when Superintendent Richard VanHoose announced at a news conference that the Jefferson County School System was going to conduct a feasibility study to determine if the time might not be ripe to turn away from the September to June school calendar. At that time he indicated that I would be director of that study, and he released the names of some half a hundred people who would serve on citizens advisory committees. Consequently, I wish to make the first point: There must be much community involvement if a school system plans to make a smooth transition away from the time-honored school calendar.

The community should be taken in on the ground floor. By using "white papers," brochures, questionnaires, and study groups the community can be involved in the decision-making process. In addition to developing a feasible extended school-year, community relations can be improved in the process. More important, however, is the idea of causing the school staff and community to see the need for innovation in school organization. Keeping instruction and curriculum relevant and updated is the prime function of the school administrator. Therefore, rescheduling of the school calendar can become the framework for building a stronger education structure. It can also cause the community to be more readily agreeable to examination of new ideas in education.

Make no mistake, the year-round school concept is controversial. Opposition will come from unexpected quarters. We learned this lesson very early in Jefferson County. A news conference was thought to be a suitable means of informing the public about the school staff's intention of conducting an extended school year feasibility study.

We received extensive coverage as a result of that news conference. You must have a considerable amount of additional information pertaining to the scope and intent of what you are about, because the news media are not equipped to give the in-depth sort of treatment desired by this topic.

In the first place there is no accepted terminology, even among school men, which adequately describes year-round or extended school year designs. Consequently, the announcements made via the news media tended to polarize opposition. Much of the opposition was created because the citizenry lacked information. Many individuals thought that extension of the school year would begin immediately, that children would be arbitrarily staggered in and out of school. In other words, the worst features of a number of plans were perceived by the people to be what the school staff would incorporate into one plan and then impose same upon the students. However, this notion was soon dispelled because the advisory committee was at work reviewing a number of school calendar plans.

Some of the plans were designed to assign pupils arbitrarily to school on a staggered basis. Because of the numerous problems these plans presented, they were, for the most part, looked upon with disfavor. But in February 1970, the Citizens Advisory Committee recommended that the school staff begin the process of informing the public about the potentials of the Continuing Four-Quarter Plan, hoping that the Board of Education through a policy decision would dictate that the plan become operational at a future date.

The Jefferson County School System made this information available to the public. The following format was developed to give the staff direction to complete the work that lay ahead:

1. a statement of philosophy which spelled out the advantages of the Continuing Four-Quarter Plan for students as well as for economic reasons.
2. a compiled list of assumptions, e.g., that each quarter consist of sixty days, that the fourth quarter be tuition free, that teachers be paid on a pro rata basis for additional days taught, upon which to make rational decisions.
3. a request for the cooperation of the State Department in determining how existing law, policy, and regulations will affect the endeavor.
4. a prepared statement as to the impact that new curriculum has upon the use of text books, supplementary books, and teaching materials.
5. the outlining of alternatives available to pupils, e.g., starting dates, vacation time, course offerings, etc.
6. spelled out procedures for the process of writing new curriculum:
    a. the size of each committee in each discipline and the various grade levels.
    b. the estimated length of time needed to complete the work.
    c. determining whether the work was to be continuous, day after day, or whether it should be on a part-time or during the summer months basis.
7. estimated costs: secretarial, substitute teacher, materials, printing, and the like.
8. a well-defined program of orientation for principals, counselors, teachers, parents, and students and designated persons responsible to carrry on the activities.

The foregoing is, in capsule, the process used in Jefferson County. Time would not permit me to outline all of the staff meetings, visits to service clubs, coffee klatches, and news briefings necessary to get the desired information across to the public. However, I wish to dwell upon the importance of keeping the news media up-to-date. I hold to the notion that there can be no secrecy in public school administration. Consequently, at every extended school-year meeting the news media were invited. Without question, the overall news coverage was excellent. The staff received much editorial support. I doubt that this would have been true had we not bent over backward to welcome and keep informed members of the press. I do not mean to say that the news media are without fault. In fact the headlines invariably gave the impression that all pupils will attend school the year-round. When the study was first announced, the headlines were so threatening to the people that our switchboard at the central office was all but overloaded for an entire day. One man called to state that the school staff had supplied him with the necessary platform plank to be elected to the General Assembly. And he stated in unequivocal terms that, if elected, he would introduce legislation to prevent children from going to school all year.

Let me suggest you inform the public of the advantages of the selected plan in the following ways:

1. The staff should visit and take part in study groups at the schools.
2. Articles of explanation should be written by students for their high school papers.
3. Students may visit a school system operating on an extended school-year plan to see what is being done there. They then should write articles, appear on television programs and work with study groups.
4. A faculty telecast with the Superintendent, the president of a teachers' organization, a research administrator, etc. can spotlight aspects of the plan that are of interest to teachers.
5. Encourage Board members and staff members to speak to service clubs and civic groups.
6. Prepare a list of twenty most frequently asked questions and give answers to these.
7. Surveys to determine the feeling of each sub part of the system must be taken.
8. Obtain letters of endorsement from civic clubs, businessmen, congressmen, and other far-sighted citizens.
9. Involved principals and supervisors in meetings to dialogue on uniform information and answers they will pass on to teachers, students, and parents.
10. Devote an issue of your school system's newsletter or paper, (illustration: Your Jefferson County Schools) to giving a brief, concise concept of your selected plan.

YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL: PHANTASMAGORICAL CARROT

Dr. B. Frank Brown

Voltaire once wrote, "There is nothing so important as an idea whose time has come." If I can paraphrase this great sage, "There is nothing quite so unimportant as an idea whose time has passed." This is what has happened to the notion of a 12-month schooling. It is an idea whose time has come and gone.

With reference to this particular conference, one must suppose that we are convened for the purpose of "making the idea come again." This should not be too difficult to do. Historically, it was a hot idea in 1904 when many education articles glowingly described "A school year of twelve months." Subsequent revivals occurred in 1924, 1947, and 1963.

The twelve-month school year calls to mind the mythological Phoenix. This fabled bird was able to burn itself to ashes and arise again later more of a paragon than before. So it is with the 12-month school year. This old chestnut has been abandoned time and again as impractical, unnecessary, and unwanted, but it always arises a decade or so later as a bright new heresy. It is my hope that this conference will either justify the viability of the concept of for once and for all time, put it back in its old familiar archives and let it rest in eternal peace.

Proponents of year-round schooling go at the notion as if time in school comprises the major part of a person's education. This must be refuted. Sociologist have clearly established that people acquire their total knowledge from six major sources: the family, peer groups, personal experiences, community organizations, mass media, and the formal school. Consider, please, that formal education is only one of the six spokes in the educational wheel; and if we expand it, we may be placing too much emphasis on it. The importance of family, peers, mass media, and experiences of work and travel should not be overlooked in the educational game. Formal schooling has, in the past, occupied only 1/6 of our total education background and there is no evidence to support an increase of this activity at the expense of the others.

Acutally, if we can believe educational research, we should be spending less time in school rather than more. James Coleman, in a major study for the U. S. Office of Education, concluded that only 15 per cent of the time in school is learning time and is of any use to an individual. If we accept this, and firmly believe it to be accurate, then we should be making a massive effort to improve what we are now doing rather than simply "adding more of the same."

School systems which have experimented with year-round schooling report such mixed figures on cost that it is difficult to asses this factor. Nashville, Tennessee found that first year costs of year-round schooling increased operating expenses by 21 per cent and that cost per pupil for the summer quarter was 64 per cent higher than in other quarters. Lexington, Kentucky found that the financing of year-round schooling required a 20 per cent increase in taxes.

The erstwhile Commissioner for New York, Jim Allen, suggests that year-round programs save money when the schools begin to graduate students early, thus offering classrooms and studies for other students. What he fails to tell us is "what do we do with the students who graduate early. Most 15- and 16-year-olds are not mature enough to handle the new morality which abounds on college campuses, much less the easy access to drugs which exists on most campuses. And for those who don't attend college, there is absolutely no job market for 15- and 16-year-olds.

The Florida State Department of Education, which I believe is one of the sponsors of this opus, concluded in a study several years ago that year-round schooling and the rotating four-quarter plan would not result in savings. The Department estimated an annual statewide savings of $3, 822, 400 on depreciation and new buildings to be constructed in the future, but it anticipated the following new expenditures which would more than offset the amount saved:

1. An increased number of registrations, promotions, graduations, and examinations which would require more staff members and at least double the administrative costs of the large schools.
2. The reduction in pupil-teacher ratio would increase instructional costs.
3. The decreased density of pupils transported on established bus routes would lead to increased per-pupil transportation costs.
4. The installation of air conditioning would result in increased additional capital outlay and operating costs.

In 1966, the Florida Educational Research and Development Council conducted a feasibility study of seven rescheduled school year plans for Polk County, Florida. The council concluded that (1) the rotating four-quarter plan would result in a 25.21 per cent increase in net expenditures, (2) if implemented, the rotating trimester plan would result in an 8.9 per cent increase in total net expenditures.

The evidence is clear that year-round education increases the cost of schooling between 20 and 25 per cent. This forces me to raise the specter of where is the money going to come from for year-round schools. There is a major taxpayers' rebellion extending throughout the length and breadth of the land, and school systems need to face up to the reality that they simply are not going to get any more money. According to a recent survey of the National Educational Association, schools in 14 states are facing a crisis similar to the one in Ohio which has chosen several times in the last two years to close schools rather than fund them, and 18 other states are "feeling the effects of a severe financial pinch."

Money may well be the decisive factor which torpedoes the present interest in an extended year.

From the aforementioned studies it can be concluded that building costs would decrease about 16 per cent over a long period of time due to a decrease in enrollment. It can be further speculated that:

1. Staggered plans tend to increase rather than decrease expenditures.
2. The only feasible all year plans developed for reducing costs involve acceleration of pupils to reduce enrollment.
3. Financial savings do not occur. During the transition period, when a new pupil attendance flow pattern is taking over to eliminate one year of schooling, costs will be higher. These adjustment costs will be primarily for increased teacher salaries, retirement benefits, and matters of this kind.

Most of the proposed plans include the use of the trimester, the split trimester, the quadrimester, or a variation on the multimester. Many of you will remember Florida's experience with trimesters. The trimester was highly touted some six years ago when the Board of Regents, with loud pronouncements of a great innovation, adopted the trimester as a year-round program for the state's universities. Subsequently, schools like the Nova High School jumped on the band wagon and instituted a trimester program. I still remember an article in the Nations Schools in April of 1964 entitled, "Trimester Plan Makes Nova Novel." Anyway, the whole notion of year-round schooling on the trimester plan was a disaster of considerable magnitude and after several years of confusion, the Board of Regents folded its tent like the Arabs and silently stole away--that is, stole away from the trimester. Unfortunately, it is still cluttering up the rest of the educational scene with other nonsense.

The trimester in Florida's schools and colleges was a failure of monumental proportions. Yet, a group of educators advocating the year-round school in New York State is pushing for this desiccated approach to the year-round school. I refer you to a booklet entitled, "Setting the Stage for Lengthened School Year Programs," a special report designed for the governor of the State of New York. This booklet extolls the virtue of the trimester as a significant new trend in school organization. It is inconceivable that the researchers completely ignored the debacle created by the trimester in Florida. My only explanation is that the ability of educators to overlook and disregard research is a unique talent peculiar to the field of professional education.

In considering year-round schooling, one must take into consideration the attitudes of teachers, parents, and students. Surveys of these groups indicate that they all may be in opposition. The big surprise is the resistance of teachers. It has generally been supposed that teachers would receive more money, but this is not the case.

In recent survey of teachers towards year-round schools, the Lockport, Illinois School System found that the majority of male teachers preferred the 180-day schedule. Of those polled, even the male teachers whose wives were employed favored the 180-day working year.

In 1966, George Gallup conducted a national poll to determine how parents felt about year-round schooling. The Gallup Poll revealed that 76 per cent of the parents were opposed to the four-quarter school plan. Sixty-eight per cent of the parents opposed reducing the summer vacation period to four weeks and only four per cent of the parents preferred this change in public education when given the choice of twelve other alternatives.

Take the case of the family with several children in school under the quarter plan. There is no assurance that all the children would be free during the same quarter. Furthermore, if the father's vacation period is not flexible, the problem is more complicated. In essence, there is no great support from parents for extending the school year.

We are in an era where there is so much democracy in the schools that it is difficult to tell who is holding the umbrella. By this I am referring to the various student advisory committees which have been set up in many schools to advise on the curriculum and matters of instruction. While it is all right for educators to discuss educational matters without involving students away from home, it is imperative that we recognize that student opinion will have great weight when you go back to the ranch and start the all-year roundup.

My own felling on year-round education is that each student today needs both a work experience and a service experience before leaving high school. The schools have not been providing these experiences and up to now, the only way a student could obtain them is during the summer when they are free to obtain work experience on the job and service experience in hospitals, industry, social agencies, and businesses. The kind of educational opportunity available in these community institutions cannot and should not be duplicated in the school system.

When one considers operating a twelve-month school, I wonder if the new student freedom has been taken under consideration. There are hundreds of schools across the country in which administrators are not able to control the students on the ten-month program. Heaven help them if they take on the additional combat which is inherent in a year-round operation. It might be well to talk to some principals who are veterans of combat duty before going too far down this road. I say this with tongue-in-cheek, but there may be more truth than fiction here.

No one has ever addressed himself properly to the question of what happens to school sports if students are not in school in the right quarter during certain sports seasons. Nor, do we have any assurance that the various state athletic associations which control athletics and are composed of principals and coaches will allow deviation from their rules which polarize athletics.

In conclusion, I am deeply troubled by the year-round school business for reasons that can best be explained by an analogy. As a small boy I was dosed with castor oil for all matters of internal malfunctions. The taste was awful, but worse still was the knowledge that if one spoolful didn't do the job, I would have to suffer through swallowing another one. What I am implying is, that we, as adults should not capriciously conclude that children are benefited from larger doses of educational castor oil simply because a small dose has not been effective. In short, we should not assume that longer school years will necessarily cure our current educational malady.

What we really need to do as educators is to ask ourselves the fundamental question: "Do we need to overhaul the school system and what is the best way to do it?"

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

One of the best sources of information about the year-round school is a publication by the the Pennsylvania Department of Education titled, The Year-Round School. This publication is superb in its honesty in discussing both sides of the question. Most of the articles in journals are written by proponents and are all favorable. But with the Pennsylvania document there is a difference. The Pennsylvania publication cites, among other things, the ten most often asked questions about year-round activity.

1. Why did previous year-round programs fail?
2. Why does the length of the school year need changing? To (a) make the school more efficient, or (b) to effect economies.
3. What will the curriculum and program of instruction be for the year-around school?
4. Where will the school district obtain funds to cover initial costs of the year-around school?
5. What should school districts do with the additional time provided by a year-around program?
6. Will teachers, parents, and students want a year-around school?
7. How much will teachers be paid?
8. Will student acceleration be involved and, if so, how will acceleration be programmed?
9. What curriculum adjustments will be necessary for teachers if chronological age acceleration leads to the entrance into secondary schools of entire classes that are a year or so younger?
10. What adjustments will secondary school teachers have to make if the elementary school keeps its children for a full seven years but, in so doing, has them complete the equivalent of the seventh grade curriculum before sending them to junior high school?

CONCLUSION

Just as the year-round school is an idea whose time has passed, there is a new movement burgeoning which appears to be an idea whose time has come.

This is the movement in industry for a four-day week in order that people can have three days each week for leisure activities. Many people interpret this movement as a further degeneration in the work ethic. You know, the early settlers to the country thought work was good and everybody should have it, and the more of it a person had the better off he was. So, they worked from dawn until dark. This ethic was epitomized in the great hymn of yesterday, "Work for the Night is Coming." The work ethic, as a great American value, has been battered to the point where it is highly vulnerable. I am speaking of the decline of the work week from 60 hours at the turn of the century to 40 hours by 1940 and the fact that most of the labor strikes of the last year have included demands for a 25 hour week.

So, I feel instead of pushing for an extended year, I would opt for a four day school week for students and allow teachers one day for planning and developing the learning program. One of the reasons that classes are so dull and children learn so little is that overly-burdened teachers do not have time for planning, consulting and working to develop interesting and exciting learning activities.

In other words, instead of extending the time in school or even rearranging it, the big need is for less time, better planning and more quality in the things that are taught and learned. The only justification for extending the school year is to further effect the "keep the kids busy syndrome."

INTERNAL PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH A YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION

Dr. Jarvis Barnes

The internal problems which are discussed in this analysis of a year-round school program are not necessarily unique to a year-round program. No attempt will be made to separate those problems which are unique to the operation as compared to those which apply mainly to a nine-month operation. Further, the identified problems have become evident over a three-year period while operating a twelve-month, four-quarter program in the high schools of the Atlanta Public Schools.

Operating procedures of a school program need to be specified in order that the discussion might be meaningful. In Atlanta, the pupils may attend any three of the four quarters, all of the four quarters, or the equivalence of three quarters by attending portions of each of the four quarters. The selection of quarters to attend is voluntary after the pupil has consecutively attended four quarters. Further, each quarter is an entity; however, emphasis is given to providing educational experiences during the fourth quarter which might not be easily scheduled or conducted during the usual school year because of external factors, such as climatic conditions, family restrictions, and conflicts with traditional school operations and community life.

The present discussion focuses on problems to which attention should be given in order to optimize the operations of a school program which has inbuilt flexibility. Whether or not these problems are solved will not necessarily result in the failure or the program. In fact, the delineation between failure and success is difficult to make. Failure and success are like night and day. They are different, but where one ends and the other begins is difficult to determine. Therefore, while one gives consideration to these identified problems, he should realize that they are components or subsets of a larger system of relationships. Also, one should realize that this is not an exhaustive list of problems; but extensive enough to call attention to critical areas of operating a school program.

The problems identified are grouped according to the rationale for operating a year-round program and according to functional areas such as administrative services, instructional services, personnel services, and supportive services. Some of the problems can be properly classified under more than one heading; but they are recorded under the one with which the problem is most probably associated.

Rationale

1. Are the school personnel, including members of the board of education and administrative staff, truly committed to making the operation a success? Do they really believe in the new organization or do they view it as a gimmick which results in more work for them without commensurate benefits?

2. Do the community and school personnel understand the rationale for having a year-round program? Are the bases realistic or is the implementation just a change?

3. Are there clear statements of objectives, operating procedures, and variables for determining significant deviations from the objectives and for determining promising practices?

4. Have the relationships and degree of continuity of the quarters with each other and with the operation over 12 months been determined? Is the program year-round, quarter-long, or several quarters in duration? Are the program and activities of the fourth quarter different from those of the other quarters? Have the relationships of the program with the series of activities been clearly developed?

5. How will implementation of the program be phased: by all divisions at once (elementary and high) or by single divisions (high only)? What are the relationship and effects of the year-round program on the adult and special education divisions?

6. What are the opinions of the teachers and pupils concerning the fourth quarter? Do they view it as being easier than the other quarters and that it really is not another quarter with "regular school work"?

7. Will regulations affecting pupils be the same during the fourth quarter as during the other quarters? For example, if the pupils are permitted to have open campus in attendance during the fourth quarter, why should they not be permitted to have open campus during the other quarters?

Administrative Services

Coordination and Implementation

1. What is the organizational structure for coordinating and implementing the new program? What group is specifically charged with the responsibility of expediting the additional amount of work relating to processing pupil records and curriculum and course requirements? Does the mechanism exist to give attention to these operations--two, three, or four times each year?

2. Who does the "trouble shooting"?

3. Who meets periodically with the principals in order for them to present their ideas and problems and to receive assistance and exchange of information concerning new developments?

4. Who obtains feedback data in order to facilitate decision making?

5. Who serves as liaison with supportive services, such as data processing and instructional services?

6. How are existing administrative personnel freed from many of the everyday problem-solving acitivities in order to devote the required, additional time to implementation of the new program? In other words, who looks after the store while the keeper is away attending a meeting concerning the new program?

7. Who develops the PERT and timetable?

8. Who does the research and evaluation?

Purchasing

Has the ordering of instructional supplies and materials been revised to accomodate the new time limits and demands?

Food Services

Will the food services program, during the fourth quarter, be reimbursed by the State/Federal government on the same basis as it is during the remaining portion of the year?

Instructional Services

Size of Schools and Classes

1. What should the optimal (or minimum) school enrollment be during the fourth quarter in order for the program to be economically feasible and educationally efficient to offer the desired courses?

2. Will a larger number of pupils who are repeating a course be placed in a class with those who are taking the course for the first time? In other words, will a sufficient number of pupils be enrolled during the fourth quarter to justify appropriate course offerings so that the instructional process will not be unduly hampered?

Staffing

1. Can a sufficient number of teachers be recruited to accommodate the instructional requirements of the fourth quarter? Some of the hampering factors are home responsibilities of teachers, vacations, travel, study, and other work experience.

2. What constitutes an instructional preparation? Are three quarter courses in English, for example, considered as three or as one preparation? Should teachers change preparations each quarter? How many preparations should they have? Will the smaller enrollments during the fourth quarter result in teachers having smaller classes and having three, four, or even five preparations?

3. Should pupils and teachers change schedules each quarter? If so, does the frequency of change hamper pupil-teacher relationships and their becoming acquainted with teach other and their working together over a longer period of time in order to overcome some identified deficiency?

4. How can the utilization of staff be optimized over 12 months when the course selections of pupils vary in type and quantity? Also, how can the demands of the first quarter be met without overloading the faculty and, at the same time, not having a surplus number of teachers during the third or fourth quarter because of a decrease in the number of pupils? This decrease might be caused by pupils' dropping out of school during the year, by pupils' graduating early, and by pupils' not electing certain disciplines during some of the quarters.

Scheduling

1. How can sufficient lead (planning) time for scheduling activities be maintained for each quarter? How can scheduling activities be designed so that principals and others will not be devoting an undue amount of time to them?

2. Why should the school day be the same for each quarter, in terms of length of day and the beginning and closing hours?

3. How can the number of pupils who will actually attend each quarter be rather accurately determined? This information is necessary in order to staff and prepare necessary course offerings.

4. What are the criteria for determining the frequency of offering courses?

5. Should alternate courses be offered during the fourth quarter in order to minimize the number of pupils needing to take the second course in a rather sequential discipline during the first quarter?

6. What are the guidelines for determining course offerings in disciplines which have a rather high degree of sequential development; for example, in disciplines such as foreign languages and mathematics?

Textbooks

1. Why should teachers collect textbooks four times during the year?

2. How can the need for additional textbooks be lessened? For example, if two courses use portions of the same textbook, should the courses be scheduled concurrently or sequentially?

3. To some degree, the composition of faculties during the fourth quarter is not the same as during the other three quarters. "Regular-term teachers" complain that "fourth quarter teachers" do not take proper care of the textbooks. Many books are lost or mutilated during the fourth quarter.

Curriculum

Has the credit problem been solved? Do pupils and parents understand the shift from such as semester hours and unit credit to quarter hours? How many course units are required for graduation? Do all courses carry the same credit?

Instruction

1. Since pupils change courses frequently, each quarter in most instances, what should be done to prevent gaps in educational experiences? For example, should teachers follow the curricular guides more closely when teaching a quarter course than when teaching a semester or a year-long course?

2. What steps should be taken to minimize teachers covering topics and using materials which pupils have already had or will have in another course?

3. What can be done to get teachers to individualize instruction? Flexibility and accommodation of pupil needs are stressed more in the year-round setting than in the former school setting.

Personnel

1. How has the rate of pay or salaries been changed in order to compensate appropriately school personnel for a longer period of service?

2. How have the fringe benefits been adjusted: benefits such as pension, annual leave, and sick leave?

3. How can a teacher get a vacation if she teaches all four quarters? Should a teacher be permitted to teach all four quarters? Can arrangements be made for her to have a couple of weeks of time off during the first three quarters?

4. What arrangements can be made to provide for overlapping which exists between post-planning activities at the end of the third quarter and implementation of the fourth quarter?

5. Do the teachers view the fourth quarter as a means to make extra money with shorter hours and most probably with a lighter teaching load?

Supportive Services

Dissemination of Information

1. How can school personnel and the general public be sufficiently informed so that they can become committed to making the operation of the year-round program a success?

2. How can sufficient information be disseminated, particularly to parents and pupils, so that they will understand the changes in course offerings and course selection?

3. How can tradition be overcome?

Data Processing Services

1. Should there be a break between quarters in order to expedite last minute scheduling changes?

2. Has additional clerical assistance been provided (at system- and at local-school levels) in order to accommodate the additional paperwork in such as scheduling and preparing cumulative and permanent records?

Other Agencies

How can the local school system cope with institutional changes in an environment which has laws, rules, and regulations designed for the traditional school operation? For example, attention needs to be given to state financial aid for the fourth quarter and to existing laws governing the length of the school year.

Facilities

1. Are the school buildings air conditioned in order to provide a relative degree of comfort during the fourth quarter?

2. Do the existing school plants have sufficient instructional spaces in order to accommodate the additional courses which will be offered? Recognition must be given to the fact that many of the additional classes will most probably be smaller than those previously scheduled.

In general, the foregoing problems are not insurmountable. Probably the most important ingredient in overcoming these problems or in solving them appropriately is for the personnel in the school system and members of the community at large to become committed to accomplishing the objectives and to operating a successful program.

OVERHAUL YEAR-ROUND CURRICULUM

Ruth Duncan

Why will year-round education fail? Because it is being offered as a solution when we haven't even agreed on what the problem is.

George Jensen, referring to curriculum in his article, "Does Year-Round Education Make Sense," published in the December 1970, issue of Compact, states: "There is ample evidence that this basic and all important segment of our educational endeavor needs overhauling." There are many in our society who would agree. Certainly not the least among them are the students themselves. Overt protest and rebellion, though perhaps the most obvious, are not the only ways impatience is demonstrated. I recently surveyed dropouts from three high schools who had enrolled in adult school. I probed for economic factors. Maybe the student just had to go to work to support himself or help his family: or perhaps he just wanted to buy himself a car or some clothes. Anyway, economics was not cited as a factor to any significant degree. What was significant was the sense of dissatisfaction and frustration with their former high schools and an impatience "to get on with it."

In answer to the question: "What needs were not met by your former school?" one-half of the respondents answered in ways similar to the following:

"It's pointless to waste years doing what can be done in months."

"They didn't take up enough time when we needed it."

"The subjects I was interested in were not offered. Also, I was not allowed to make use of my better judgment."

One simply said, "All kinds."

Other statements were in language I cannot repeat anywhere.

Meanwhile, back at the high school, my English department of 23 teachers was engaged in an evolutionary stage in their change process. They had coped with the trauma of unsuccessfully presenting the traditional American and British literature surveys to heterogeneous groups of students by rushing through Hawthorne in the eleventh grade and Chaucer in the twelth during the first semester. I preceived this as a moratorium to buy time rather than a last stand for cherished tradition. (After all, half of the students could not read the material adequately.) The handwriting on the wall said clearly that they, as teachers, were not able to make these things relevant. As an alternative, they prepared to offer 21 electives in English for students in grades 10 through 12.

What happened? I was deluged with requests for conferences by "academically elite" students. Their protest? "There is nothing offered to prepare me for college."

This happened in one school, but it is not unique. Silberman, in his book Crisis in the Classroom, reported that "some 348 high schools in 38 states and the District of Columbia experienced some kind of serious disruption as a result of student protests. The disruptions occurred in every kind of school, in every kind of community, in every part of the country,"

There are other observable, more alarming negative behaviors for which it might be unfair to hold our education system responsible. Nevertheless, there is little that is consistent and promising that schools can point to as having helped to prevent or to alleviate these behaviors.

My point is that protests come from students from diverse sources and for diverse stated reasons. But they are all saying, "My needs are not being met."

Protests also come from parents. Let me tell you about this one as an example. On my faculty there is a highly creative, articulate humanities teacher. She is leading a science and English teacher in a team approach with 120 twelth graders this year in an interdisciplinary consideration of MAN. The year's program deals with four questions:

1. What does it mean to be human? as viewed by the scientist, the humanist, the writer, and the individual student.
2. Why are humans on this earth? as viewed by religion and science in world literature, and by students themselves.
3. What is leberty? What is justice? as viewed by science, morality, and ethics; political philosophy; world literature; and individual students.
4. What is the good life? In light of problems of population, eugenics and food; world-wide utopian literature; and individual student opinion.

Activities and experiences are widely varied. Speakers from the community, the university, and the specialists on the faculty within the school have been used as resources as appropriate. Readings have been both extensive and intensive, drawing on sources from the ancients to the most contemporary.

At the first meeting with parents after the first nine weeks of school, one mother said, "I don't like what you're teaching my child. When I went to school, we had American literature in the eleventh grade and British literature in the twelth and I just loved it. I really think students are missing something when you water things down this way. They're just not being prepared for college."

That was the least of the protests. A minister parent got up and read a five minute tirade citing passages from books which dealt with some of the current alienation problems of youth and then asked if there were a lawyer in the group. There was. He chose to respond and waxed eloquently in the program's and in the teachers' favors.

Parents are protesting and can be a very formidable block to creativeness in curriculum change. Further, although school people may not lose jobs over it, financial support may not be forthcoming when opportunities are provided at the poles. What's more, the backlash is translated to state legislatures, the Congress of the United States, and the President himself.

Then there are guidelines from USOE, boards of education, county offices, and state legislatures which lock us in with mandates like:

1. School will be open only between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m.

2. You will teach these courses and within these grade limitations.

3. Teachers see little value in most assistant principals for curriculum. They'd rather have a raise instead. Consequently, we hereby eliminate the position of A.P.C.

There is evidence of a need for overhauling the curriculum. That may be a solution. But what's the problem? If we examine the evidence relative to the protests cited in this paper, one inference is clear: I submit that the problem is that there are no clear agreements concerning the goals of public education in our society. Not only is there a gap between what many parents and students perceive as the purposes, and what many teachers perceive as the purposes, but there is a gap from teacher to teacher and from department to department within any one school. I asked him, "What's the purpose for taking Algebra anyway?" "Why, to get ready for Calculus," he replied.

Serving on a visiting Committee for the Southern Association for Colleges and Schools, I studied the following statement that had been prepared by the faculty.

> The purpose of a school is to promote the development of the individual for personal, social, and economic living as a participating member of a democratic society.
>
> This general purpose includes the following:
>
> Understanding and an appreciation of the social heritage and an acceptance or responsibility for evaluating and contributing to it.
>
> Formulation by the individual of moral and ethical values which will serve as guides to desirable conduct in personal, family, and community living.

Maturation of intellectual abilities and processes, including self-direction, critical thinking, and problem solving.

Development of an appreciation of aesthetic values.

Growth in creative ability and in the use of media of communication such as speech, reading, writing and mathematics.

Development of economic and vocational competency.

In conclusion, the school must function mutually with the home and the community to the end that the academically talented students, the average students, and the students of limited capabilities receive encouragement for the cultivation of the heart, the mind, and the will for personal achievement and for worthy citizenship.

No matter what the statement of purposes, operationally, academically talented students were well served in that school academically. However, even they, in my opinion, were being cheated of participation in genuine community, essential to self-fulfillment in our pluralistic society.

Operationally, at least 75 per cent of their population has been categorized and segragated into classrooms with the least experienced teachers. My point is that the operational curriculum in that school was in direct conflict with the philosophical implications in their goal statements. I doubt that this is an exceptional situation.

I doubt that that school is unique in that respect. Indeed, the literature on year-round education in discussing curriculum implications frequently presents as advantages the acceleration of the academically talented and more time for the average and slow to complete requirements. Students who fail can still get through on time, as if there is something magic about twelve years.

If academic performance, accelerated or not, is to be the major aim for operation year-round, then deliver me from it as an educator, a taxpayer, and a grandmother. More of what we have is just not good enough for the youth of America. Any attempt to continue in the same vein--year-round or not--is sure to fail.

Now let's take off our blinders and free ourselves from tunnel vision. Let's free ourselves from our fear of change and grid ourselves for what Toffler calls "future shock" and think about year-round education--for what? Because until we can agree among ambiguity and confusion to parents, students, legislators, Congressmen, and the President of the United States, who opened his Education message of March 3, 1970, with: "American Education is in urgent need of reform."

Let's overhaul the curriculum, Dr. Jensen, and let's start with "for what?"--"to what ends?"

In scheduling for the second semester, a student came to me in tears. "Mr. Nelson won't let me register for independent study." "What do you want to study?" I asked. "I don't know, but I'm a good student and I'm tired of wasting time in the classroom with all those dumb kids."

I gave her a form to prepare an independent study proposal and assured her that if she developed something that seemed worthy of pursuit, she could embark on an independent study.

At the same time, however, I explained that there really isn't any agreement concerning the purpose of public schools in America. My philosophy will not acknowledge that preparation for college can be the major aim. We have to live in this world with all kinds of people and each has some uniqueness which warrants the admiration of others if we but look for it. Her response was that she had never thought of that.

The young lady who was requesting the independent study certainly has not the knowledge, the skills, or the sensitiveness to others necessary to being a successful "participant in genuine community." Nor did the 23 eleventh graders who petitioned for a course in Great Books. They gave as their reason preparation for college and scholarship examinations. I honored their petition but regretted their tunnel vision. I wanted them to say, "We want to be helped to discover the permanent relevance of great ideas in facilitating and enhancing my participation in "genuine community."

Now, I maintain that if we are not accomplishing this--preparing our youth for participation in genuine community--we cannot justify our continued existence because that's what America is all about.

What are ways and means to be employed to give our youth the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to insure achievement of the kind of world Samuel Proctor implies in his "feeling of genuine community" or what the Shanes term the "chiliastic era" and what our young people sing about in "The Age of Aquarius"? Will year-round education help us answer these questions with anymore responsiveness and flexibility than a nine or ten month school year has in the past?

The potential for providing more extensive opportunities for personal growth in human relations; group processes for decision making; and development of individual aesthetic, intellectual and vocational talent as essential to self-actualization demands that we chance it. But in the chancing we must prepare to cope with the uneasiness of universities, accrediting agencies, teachers, parents, and students.

Every resource in the community, human and other wise, must be mobilized for the endeavor. Accordingly, the assumption that a genuinely certified teacher is the only one qualified to provide educational experiences for youngsters has to be examined. The concept that education can be acquired while students are contained within four walls, five days a week, seven and a half hours per day divided into fifty minute blocks has to go. The arbitary segmentation by age or grade level has to go.

The tradition that studies in the four academic areas of English, social studies, math, and science are more productive in achieving a sense of "genuine community" than physical education, art, music, dance, and drama as well as vocational-technical education has to go.

Time must be bought for teachers, students, parents, and community leaders to plan together to determine the nature and scope of the educational program to be provided. Funding agencies, local, state and national must stand by, ready to support without bias whatever the school and community design for themselves.

Many educators and youth are saying that the major problem among mankind today is the failure to acknowledge that we are our brothers' keeper, not his killer. All have a right to survive if any survive. Getting a post-high school degree or learning how to make money are not enough to survive.

Other people are saying the opposite, particularly parents who perceive education as a way of escaping the world of work. "I want my children to have an education so they won't have to work as hard as I did" is still a major rationale. No one is more aware of the fallacy in this rationale than the people who have become "educated." Nevertheless, there are many people who feel this way and it is a potent force in resisting change.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL

Dr. R. L. Johns

A number of boards of education are beginning to develop plans to provide more extensive educational programs during the summer months. For many years, a number of educational, business and professional leaders have questioned the rationale behind the common practice of using school personnel and the school plant for only nine months of the year. Why, it has been asked over and over, do we continue to operate schools for only nine months? Apparently it is because at one time the labor of children was needed on the farm, but now less than 6 percent of our work force is engaged in farming! At the present time the average length of school term in 51 representative countries of the world is 210 days. Since it is quite possible that the school year will be extended substantially during the next decade, it is appropriate that we examine the extent of the additional financial requirements for this possible extension of the school year.

Extended school year plans have been under consideration since the beginning of the 20th century. Hundreds of articles and monographs and a number of books and dissertations have been written on this subject. Many of these plans are very similar in nature and the differences have no significance for financing. Therefore, we will examine only a sufficient number of these plans to indicate the types of extended school year plans that will increase or decrease school costs.

There are many types of extended school year plans and many of these plans vary in purpose. Following is a list of some of these purposes:

1. To save money by reducing the amount of school plant facilities needed.
2. To save money by accelerating the progress of pupils and thereby reducing enrollment.
3. To save money by reducing the number of pupils who are required to repeat a grade thereby reducing enrollment.
4. To make better utilization of costly school plant facilities which at the present time are largely unused during three months of the year.
5. To make better utilization of the time of pupils during the summer months.
6. To provide enriched learning opportunities for pupils.
7. To give students who fail during the regular year the opportunity to make up during the summer months the work in which they are behind.
8. To give teachers employment for a full calendar year.
9. To increase the annual income of teachers.
10. To assist in meeting the teacher shortage by reducing the total number of teachers needed.
11. To meet a temporary building shortage.

Some extended school year plans developed primarily to accomplish certain of these purposes will result in increased school costs, while other plans might either decrease school costs or hold them constant. From the standpoint of financial policy, an extended school year plan that increases school costs is sound if it increases the quantity and/or the quality of educational opportunity proportionately or more than proportionately and it is unsound if it either does not increase or it decreases the quantity and/or quality of educational opportunity provided. Conversely, adoption of an extended school year plan that decreases school costs is sound fiscal policy if it either does not decrease or it increases the quantity and/or quality of educational opportunity provided and it is unsound if it decreases the quantity and/or quality of educational opportunity proportionately or more than proportionately.

In projecting educational costs for the future, it is assumed that most boards of education will adopt extended school year plans that are sound both educationally and fiscally. It is likely that some such plans will increase school costs and that other plans will not increase school costs.

Various proposals have been made for extending the school program over most of the calendar year. How much would it increase school costs to operate schools substantially year-round? The costs of alternative plans will vary considerably. Unfortunately, very few studies are available which utilize operations research methods in analyzing the cost of alternative methods. However, a study was made in 1966 by the Florida Educational Research and Development Council in which operations research methods were used to analyze the relative costs of seven different types of extended school yerm and all year plans of school operation.

The study was conducted in a school system with an enrollment of approximately 50,000 pupils. These pupils were taught by 1,763 teachers. The pupils were housed in 59 elementary centers ranging from 115 to 1,112 in enrollment and in 29 junior and senior high school centers ranging from approximately 100 to 1,900 in enrollment. Polk county is a county unit school system serving a population which is located largely in small towns and cities, the largest of which had a total population of approximately 30,000. Therefore, Polk County represents a cross section of urban and rural territory, and estimates of the additional costs of year-round schools and extended school terms for Polk County should be fairly representative for the nation except, perhaps, for large city school systems.

The Board of Education of Polk County requested the research staff to estimate the additional costs which would be involved in operating the various types of plans for year-round schools and extended school terms that had been experimented with or had been suggested. The Board also requested that in estimating the additional costs, the staff assume that the quality and quantity of the educational program provided under each plan be at least equivalent to that provided under the school system's present program. This was difficult to do for some plans. However, the research staff assumed that, insofar as quantity was concerned, a student should be entitled to as many days and hours of school time in grades one through twelve as was provided under the present plan. Under the present plan of operations, schools are operated for 180 days and a student receives 2,160 days of schooling if he progresses normally from grade 1 through grade 12.

In order to hold quality constant, the staff assumed that each student in high school should have the opportunity to take at least as many types of courses under the different plans under consideration as he would under the present plan, and that the same level of supporting instructional services would be available. In making the analysis of the elementary schools, it was assumed that quality would be held constant if no teacher were required to teach more grades in the same classroom that she was teaching under the present plan. That is, if a school under the present plan of operation is so organized as to have one teacher per grade, the costs of the proposed new typed of plans were computed on the basis of providing a teacher per grade in that school and the same types of supporting instructional services as are now provided.

At the time of the study, schools were operated for 180 days in Polk County, but teachers were paid for ten months, which provided for an additional eixteen days of preschool and postschool planning. The additional costs for each plan considered were computed first in dollars and then in terms of percentage of increase for each plan. School systems paying teachers for less than ten months would have a slightly different percentage increase for the different types of plans. However, the percentage differential among the different types of plans should remain approximately the same.

PLAN I. The Present Program.

The present program in Polk County provides for only a limited summer term beyond the regular 180 day term. State appropriations provide only for paying the salaries of approximately 12 per cent of the teachers for the extended school term. Summer sessions are operated for approximately six weeks in a number of communities. Attendance in the summer session is voluntary. Students may take enrichment courses in science, art, music, drama and physical education for the purpose of broadening their background. No fees are charged for these courses. A limited number of academic subjects are offered. These courses, as well as make-up courses, are offered on a tuition basis. All estimates of costs for the different extended year plans are based upon the increased costs they would ential in comparison with the present program.

PLAN II. The Present Program Plus a Summer Program Operated Without Cost to Parents -- Voluntary Attendance.

This program is the same as Plan I with a regular school year of 180 days and 16 planning days for the faculty. The difference is that the summer program would be operated for 30 days with the entire cost being paid for by the School Board. The summer program would be available to all pupils for the following purposes:

1. To make up a subject or subjects that had been failed during the academic year.
2. To take a new subject or subjects for the purpose of graduating earlier.
3. To take courses for enrichment purposes such as art, science, math, music, drama, and the like.

There will be some immediate increase in the cost under this plan; but over a period of years, the increased cost will be offset, at least in part, by savings in the cost of reteaching students who had not been promoted.

It is extremely difficult to make an accurate estimate of the increased costs of this plan. If 50 per cent of the total student body were to attend this six-weeks extended summer school program and 50 per cent of the teaching staff were to be employed, it is estimated that costs would be increased by approximately 6 per cent. However, this plan would provide some increase in quality because of the extended opportunities for enrichment.

PLAN III. The Present Program Plus a Summer Program Operated Without Cost to Parents but With Compulsory Attendance for Students Who Are Not Promoted and Voluntary Attendance for Others.

Plan III is different from Plan II in only one respect. The Board of Public Instruction would require all students who failed to earn promotion during the regular school year to attend the summer session. It is estimated that the additional cost of this plan would be approximately the same as Plan II.

PLAN IV. A Staggered Four-Quarter System Requiring One-Fourth of the Pupils to be on Vacation Each Quarter.

The calendar year would be divided into four quarters of 12 weeks each. Students would be expected to attend school three quarters during each calendar year. This means that the school authorities would have to assign the students so that 25 per cent of the students would be on vacation during each quarter and 75 per-cent would be in school. This plan has been promoted by various business groups (especially the Chamber of Commerce) from time to time.

The advocates of this plan have argued, without making a cost analysis, that this plan would save money. As a matter of fact, this is the most expensive plan that has yet been proposed, assuming that the quality and quantity of the education program are not lowered.

The four-quarter plan, with one fourth of the pupils on vacation at all times and three fourths in school, actually requires that each school be divided into four schools.

It is estimated that Plan IV probably would increase school costs by more than 25 per cent without increasing school quality. As a matter of fact, school quality might even be damaged under this plan. Furthermore, wherever this plan has been tried, parents have objected strenuously.

PLAN V. Four Quarters of Continuous Study. Makes Possible Graduation from Elementary School One Year Earlier and Graduation from Secondary School One Year Earlier.

Under this plan the school year would be divided into four quarters of 11 weeks each and all students would be required to attend all four quarters. Students would be in school for 44 weeks each year with a two-week Christmas vacation and a six-week summer vacation.

Such a plan could reduce the number of calendar years required to complete the public school program from 12 to 10. This would result in students entering college or the labor market two years earlier than they do at present. However, to offset this early graduation, it would be possible to change the ages of entering school from six to seven, in which case the students would graduate from secondary school only one year younger than at present.

No plan of year-round school operation examined by the research staff was found to reduce school costs unless the plan operated to reduce school enrollment. It was found that school enrollment theoretically could be reduced 16 2/3 per cent under Plan V but the school would operate longer. However, it is possible that the quality of the school program might be damaged by accelerating students as much as two years.

This plan would require an immediate annual increase in expenditure of approximately 14.7 per cent. However, this percentage would decline to less than half that amount after five years and after ten years there should be a reduction of approximately 4.23 per cent in net expenditures.

PLAN VI. The Trimester Plan -- Two-Thirds of the Students in School and One-Third on Vacation Each Trimester.

This plan calls for the school year to be divided into three trimesters of 75 days each. All students would attend schools for two trimesters each year and be on vacation for one trimester. To compensate for the shortened number of days, the school day would have to be 7 1/2 hours in length. It is possible that this plan might lower school quality. Insofar as the researchers could determine, no school system in the United States has as yet attempted to operate under this plan.

This plan would also be more expensive than the present plan. It is estimated that Plan VI would increase school costs about 9 per cent and at the same time probably reduce the quality of the educational program.

PLAN VII. Three Trimesters of Continuous Study Providing for Students to Graduate One Year Early in Elementary School and One Year Early in Secondary School.

Under this plan, the school year would be divided into three trimesters of 15 weeks or 75 days each. This plan would keep the pupils in school for a total of 45 weeks each year with a two-week Christmas vacation and a five-week summer vacation. This program is similar to the four quarters of continuous study in that an elementary pupil could complete the six grades in five calendar years. The secondary pupils could complete the junior and senior high school in five calendar years.

The cost of operating Plan VII would be practically identical with Plan V. Therefore, it is estimated that eventually net school expenditures could be reduced approximately 4.23 per cent per year. It would require an increase in school funds of approximately 14.7 per cent to inaugurate Plan VII. This increase would gradually be reduced, and after ten years the anticipated reduction of 4.23 per cent in net expenditures should be realized.

PLAN VIII. Operate all Schools for 210 Days Providing Continuous Study for All Pupils. Provide One Additional Year of Enriching Study in the Elementary School and Graduate One Year Early in Secondary School.

The primary purpose of Plan VIII is not to reduce school expenditures but to increase the quality level and to obtain a greater return from the funds now being expended.

Under Plan VIII pupils would have one year of enrichment and one year of acceleration. The additional cost of initiating this plan would be approximately 11 per cent, but after eleven years of operation this plan would reduce schools costs by an estimated .72 per cent. Attention is directed to the fact that Plan VIII would provide almost one year of enrichment and one year of acceleration for slightly less money than the cost of the present school program. Therefore, of all the plans considered, the 210 day continuous progress school program gives the greatest return per dollar expended when both quanitity and quality of the program are taken into consideration.

SUMMARY

The Research Division of the National Education Association in 1968 summarized the research on the rescheduled school year or the extended school year which had been completed up to that time. In general, that research summary corroborated the findings of the Florida study and did not produce any additional findings of financial significance.

A review of the research on the financial implications of extended school year plans was undertaken in order to determine whether the initiation of extended school year plans would increase or decrease school costs, or whether any such plans might provide increased educational benefits received from a given amount of dollars invested in education. The financial research in this area is limited -- especially research involving cost benefit studies. However, sufficient evidence is available to indicate the following:

1. Several extended school year plans are available which when initially installed will increase school costs a maximum of 10 to 11 per cent, but after the transition period will result in no increase or even a small reducation in costs while providing a greater quantity or better quality of educational services.

2. Extended school year plans which provide for enrichment only with no pupil acceleration and with voluntary pupil participation may result in an increase in school costs of up to five or six per cent.

3. Some extended school year designs developed primarily to save classroom space may actually increase operating costs more than the building costs that may be saved. Such plans usually have a short life and are not likely to be of much consequence in the future.

4. There will be a substantial increase in the number of school districts providing for extended school terms in the next ten years. However, this will not be a major factor affecting school expenditures.

YEAR ROUND SCHOOL AND THE PUBLIC. . . (WHICH IS PLURAL)

Ned S. Hubbell

Said the man on the street, "Good idea....much more economical use of those expensive school buildings." Said the personnel directors of major industries, "If we had enough lead time we could gear our vacation schedules to it."

Those two reactions came from a public opinion survey in a community where the public school system was studying the idea of year-round school.

They were just part of the answers obtained from people who would be affected by such a plan.

Parents of children in school weren't so sure.

On the initial public opinion survey, parents included in the sampling indicated a slight percentage favoring year-round schools. But that slim majority of parents added a footnote:

"Based on what I now know about it," they said, "it sounds cheaper than paying higher taxes to build additional schools."

Had the school system launched a year-round plan, based on that evidence, that district would be in trouble with its "public" by now. Not with all of the audiences affected by such a plan, true. But lack of support came rolling in on a follow-up feedback attempt.

The slight majority of parents was a tip-off to take a closer look at the opinions of all parents. Too many "yes" respondents in the survey said, "...based on what I know about it..." Too many added a footnote: "It depends on what vacation schedule we get," they said.

So the district polled all parents, through a compact, simple questionnaire... a "Parent Preference Poll." Parents selected their vacation quarter, so the computer could crank out simulated student class schedules, by quarter.

In that survey, 87 per cent of the parents of children now in school indicated their preference for the summer vacation quarter. Change to a new plan, they said, but don't inconvenience me.

Meanwhile, back in the classrooms, teachers were polled, too. They turned down the concept of year-round school. Soundly. While those immediately affected, students, weren't asked.

The Board of Education, uncertain as to why a "more economical" school year was not acceptable to parents, held informal feedback sessions in every one of the district's 33 schools. Here the answers came: "We had nothing to say about whether the district should study year-round schools," they said. "The plan was designed and then we're asked to choose a vacation quarter." "It's all too quick a change," others added. "Too much too soon, too quick, too fast." "No other school districts were doing it," they said, "why pick on us?"

Teachers, through their professional association, also complained that they had not had a chance to participate in the study until after the plan was drafted. "This is just another example of administrative decision-making that affects every teacher, but none of us have anything to say about it."

Custodians, school secretaries, bus drivers, and cafeteria personnel grumbled even more. No one had even asked their opinions. "After all, we work here, too," they said.

This particular school system has scrapped the idea of year-round school. Their public, at least most of it, wasn't having any of that change.

The illustration, it seems to me, makes a point. Several of them. First of all, the "public" of a school system...people in the community affected, directly or indirectly by actions of that school system, is plural.

The plurality includes several, key publics: *students, *staff, *parents, *people who do not have children in public school, *businessmen, industrialists, etc.

Each of those audiences affected by year-round school, illustrated some basic psychological principles which relate to change...(and that's a synonym for year-round school).

Each audience indicated the conditions, with people, that relate to and determine the success or failure of dealing with change.

Principle #1: Persons tend to change, to accept new ideas when they have participated in the decision to change.

Second: Persons tend to change when they see others changing, particularly when the change direction is supported by valued persons.

Third: Persons tend to change to the degree they trust the motives of the person or persons attempting to induce change.

Fourth: Persons tend to change to the degree that they see the change has been successful, especially if they are able to gather data for themselves.

Fifth: Persons tend to change more readily if they are able to influence, reciprocally, the person or persons who are attempting to influence them.

Sixth: Persons tend to maintain change if there is a public committment to that change.

And, finally: Persons tend to resist change to the degree they feel it is imposed on them.

Based on our experiences with districts studying year-round school, a public relations program is a "must" if that concept is to become a reality. If not, if we don't "take the public(s) with us," at every step of the way, year-round school will fail. In a nutshell, some basic public relations steps should be followed in order to achieve public understanding and acceptance of year-round school.

First of all, a thorough analysis ought to be made of the publics affected by such a change. That list will include those we've already mentioned, and perhaps many more...students, staff members, parents, businessmen and industrialists, etc.

As in any other administrative orpolicy decision that required communication for that decision to be effectively carried out, we need to ask ourselves:

Who ought to know about this plan? Who is most affected by such an idea?
How do we reach them (and listen to their views)?
When should we tell them (and listen to their opinions)?
What should we say?

A priority list of audiences needs to be prepared, in the initial talking and thinking stages of a study of year-round school. We need to examine ways of getting them involved in that study, and of keeping them informed throughout the study, while keeping the pipeline of their opinions open at the same time.

At the same time, we might put together a list of advantages and disadvantages of a year-round plan for school operation for each of those priority audiences. Those pros and cons should be part of our study, part of our search for answers and solutions.

Representatives of each priority audiences should be involved in the study of a year-round school plan, to help sift the data, examine alternatives, and voice concerns.

Internal and external audiences alike are usually pretty poorly informed about what goes on in school.

The 1969 Gallup Survey, "How the Nation Views the Public Schools", concluded: "The public is, at best, only partly informed about their schools and very poorly informed about education itself."

(The school district in our illustration would have made a mistake to have assumed that partly-informed parents were in favor of a year-round school plan. The more those parents found out about the plan, the less they favored it.)

Said the 1970 Gallup Survey:

> "The public has an appetite for more information about the schools and what they are doing or trying to do....It isn't simply a matter of 'selling' present policies. It is important to tell the public about its schools, but it is also incumbent upon the schools to listen to the public's views...."

That's why it's important, that a systematic process of (two-way) communication is a vital part of any year-round school plan. The need for involvement of people affected by such a plan means a necessity to develop more planned methods of putting ourselves in the other fellow's shoes. Such a program of community relations requires an audience-orientation, not a message orientation. It means providing for input, not just output of information about year-round use of buildings. It involves small advisory groups, carefully-structured sampling for opinion gathering, continuing dialogue, and honest assessments.

A communication and public relations program ought to include, in the planning stages, the search for appropriate channels of listening to people and of talking with them. Thorough press coverage is important, true, as is radio and television news coverage. Simple, explanatory printed materials are important, perhaps. But a more important communication consideration is the need to find ways to listen to people and report to them in a manner that is convenient to them (not just to us). That may require us to search for some "unconventional" channels of communication.

It might be in order, for example, to examine our approach at school tax levy time. Most of us have discovered, some time ago, that publicizing the tax levy election in the mass media isn't enough to turn out the "yes" vote (it usually works quite well with the "no" vote!). Even speeches to normally-supportive groups, like the Rotary Club, the PTA, and Band Boosters, isn't enough.

Now we've learned to dissect the town into small, neighborhood units. We recruit hundreds of citizen volunteers to hold informal coffee "klatches", to ring doorbells, to call parents on election day, drive them to the polls, and check them off when they come in to vote. That kind of well-organized, face-to-face effort is a must in my state if we're to get voters to accept increased taxes and pull the "yes" lever.

I submit a similar type of communication effort may be required if we hope to convince citizens of the wisdom of year-round school. A neighborhood, face-to-face, coffee-klatch campaign? Why not? Year-round school may represent a more serious change to citizens than even a request for additional school tax dollars. And that type of carefully planned, timetabled communication effort should be scheduled to "peak" just right....when the school district and its advisory councils feel a decision should or must be made on a year-round plan.

Such a communication effort should begin inside the school system. If we don't listen and talk to students and staff members abour year-round schools, what we say to "outsiders" may not matter. Our staff and students may be telling a quite different story.

Our messages to each audience ought to be tailored for that specific aduience. The concerns of students may be quite different than the concerns of industrial personnel managers. Parents will feel quite differently about the inconvenience of changing vacation habits than will those citizens who do not have children in school. Operational employees may have a far different viewpoint than that of teachers. In other words, our information can't be a general broadside. It needs to be specifically tailored to each priority audience.

Let's examine the possibility of using some other unconventional communication channels....unconventionally utilized by school districts, that is. How about organizing informal feedback and information sessions with the community barbers? With beauty operators, mailmen, bartenders, laundromat operators, in spots where people talk a lot! That type of public arena may be much more effective than the traditional 20-minute speech to the Rotary Club or PTA.

Let's examine, carefully, what we say in print. We need to weed out the "pedaguese" and keep it straightforward, in common, every day language that all citizens can understand. And we'd better be in a position to back up what we say.

One final suggestion, in the for-what-it's-worth department: we may have to convince each of our priority audiences....students, staff, and parents, that year-round school will provide a better education for youngsters, not just an economical or administrative advantage.

For such a change to be adopted, school districts may have to visualize the results for constituents, show them "what's in it" for each audience. It may take that kind of evidence to overcome the inconvenience of changed vacations, of different community life patterns, even if year-round school can be accomplished at a lower cost than by building additional schools.

Acceptance, by the community, of year-round school will not materialize, perhaps, if we continue to communicate about that change in the traditional ways school systems have communicated with staff, students, parents, and the general public.

What used to work, in school-community dialogue, doesn't any more. (It probably never did!) Great quantities of time and effort, even money, invested in two-way communication may well be the most vital part of every year-round school plan. Success in this aspect of such a plan may be necessary if we hope to broaden public understanding and acceptance of it. All kinds of people need to get involved in a planned effort to increase the flow of information and ideas, opinions and attitudes, in both directions. While I realize that even more effective two-way communication may bring about understanding of year-round school, it may still not result in agreement.

But it's worth the risk. And it is certainly better than the alternatives.

ANALYSIS: WORK ON A SOLUTION

Dr. Tom Chapman

Tomorrow's schools will be schools without walls, a school built with doors open to the entire community. Tomorrow's schools will reach out for places that enrich the human spirit, to museums, theaters and art galleries, to the parks and rivers and mountains. Tomorrow's schools will ally themselves with the city, busy streets and factories, assembly lines, and laboratories so that the world of work does not become an alien place for students. Tomorrow's schools will be the center of community life for grown ups as well as children, a shopping center of human services. They might have a community health clinic, a public library, a theatre, and recreation facilities. They will provide formal education for all citizens and will not close doors anymore at 3 p.m.

A large percentage of children of school age, particularly in towns and cities, are left without any constructive or developmental program during the summer months. So if we assume that education does not stop with June and start with September then I think we have to take another look at the extended school year or the 12-month program.

I would like to react to several comments that my colleages made in their various discussions in relationship to the extended school year. I think it was very appropriate to react to these comments in relation to two or three of the presenters. There was no determination to separate the problems unique in the operation in a nine-month program and in those in operation in a year-round program. Many of the problems that were presented are in existence in our nine-month program today, so we know what the problems are. But what is the solution?

Dr. Jarvis mentioned separating the problems of the nine-month in relation to the 12-month program. I give a lot of credit to Atlanta for running a fairly well equipped 12-month program. Atlanta leads the south in this. He mentioned that the county committed to accomplishing the objectives of a year-round school. Commitment is necessary and must be a vital factor before any solution can be made in relationship to following this extended school year.

Mrs. Duncan mentions many things that were problems in our school system, mentioning that the extended school year was not the solution. Maybe we need to change what we are doing now and extend it into a longer year. We do have an experimental school in our county. Much has been said pro and con by many people inside and outside the state. But one thing has been proven--that those students who are on 212-days benefit much more than those on a 180-day school year in relationship to achievement scores and things of that nature. But I think politics will tell you that you can learn more by going a little longer in the year and studying more than being off doing other things. I was very impressed with one thing she did mention in relationship to the potential for providing more extensive opportunities for personal growth in human relations, group processes for decision making, and for individual talent development and potential.

We must be prepared to cope with teachers, parents, and students who have assumed that a generally certified teacher is the only one qualified to provide educational experiences for youngsters. Every resource in the community, human and otherwise must be mobilized for the endeavor. The concept that education can be acquired while students were contained within four walls five days a week, 7 1/2 hours a day, divided into 50 minute blocks must go. The tradition that in the four academic areas of English, social studies, math, and science are more productive than physical education, art, music, dance, and drama has to go. Power must be brought to teachers, students, parents, and our community leaders to plan together to determine the nature and scope of the educational program to be provided.

Funding agencies, local and state and national, must stand by ready to support what the school and community designed for itself.

Mr. Johns mentioned the fact that it was easy to change state funding in relationship to more projects for the school system. I say if this can be done we should go forth with great speed in relationship accomplishing this. Everyone understands that we are going to be in some financial difficulties in the state if school costs keep going up.

I think Mr. Hubbell very ably listed all of the problems that go along with the necessity of making the public aware of what is going on in the school. He has identified the problem but he has not given us the solution to it.

We know what the problem is, now we need to work on a solution to it.

STATE PROJECT IN DADE COUNTY

Martin Rubenstein

The Quinmester Plan is developed around a calendar design that divides the school year into 45 days or 9 week sessions. Each pupil may then elect to attend any four quinmesters during the school year. Vacation periods would be staggered throughout the calendar year so that 4/5 of the total school population is in session during any given quinmester and 1/5 of the school population would be on vacation. Selected students might be considered for attendance during the fifth quinmester, making it possible for them to accelerate their high school graduation.

The summer term, or fifth quinmester, is conceived as being different from present summer programming. The summer term is expected to be an extension of the four other terms and is not meant to be primarily a vehicle for remedial and enrichment work.

The same operational options reported in the four quarter plan (Plan V) are available in this plan. Teachers may elect annual employment (5 quinmesters) so as to total a 237 day employment period not including holidays or elect 4 quinmesters of employment totaling 190 days of employment excluding holidays.

The quinmester plan is essentially a plan to affect savings in secondary school utilization. Although an elementary school format could be developed to allow some acceleration and remedial experience for selected elementary school pupils.

The quinmester plan theoretically increases the capacity of school plants by 25%. A school having a capacity of 2,000 pupils could conceivably enroll 2,500 and due to the staggered attendance periods have but 2,000 pupils in attendance during any given quinmester. Increased plant capacity could also be achieved through an acceleration procedure developed under this plan. The fact that the fifth quinmester coincides closely with the Dade County Base Plan for summer school operation is likely to make attendance in summer school for acceleration purposes more appealing. To achieve the maximum benefit from this plan relative to plant utilization 4/5 of the total secondary school population would need to be in attendance each quinmester.

The degree to which pupils avail themselves of the acceleration factor in the quinmester plan will materially affect the utilization economies. A large number of pupils attending the 5th quinmester to facilitate acceleration from senior high school would to an extend negate the projected potential 25% increase in plant utilization. Some of the students completing their secondary school experience in 5 years instead of the traditional 6 years.

The quinmester plan requires the same extensive revisions of personnel policies and procedures as the four quarter plan.

In the operation of the quinmester plan since only 80% of a school's membership is in attendance during any given quarter, while 20% of the pupils are vacationing a 20% reduction in the teaching staff is possible. The employment period of the total instructional staff however, need not increase since only 4/5 of the total instructional staff are required for the fifth quinmester. The instructional staff may, however, by given annual employment status and those persons not required for teaching assignments could be involved in staff development programs or elect to go on leave at this time for university study or travel. The sample calendar (attached) indicates a change in the number of planning days, thus the increase of 45 days of instructional time for pupils is projected to be a 41 day increase in the employment period of the teaching staff.

The factors of reduced staffing needs, the lengthened employment period for the instructional staff plus the elimination of the present summer school academic program, would decrease the school system's expenditure for instructional salaries by an estimated 4%.

The administrative problems created by the quinmester plan are similar to those problems found in the four quarter plan. Record keeping and pupil-teacher scheduling would appear to be the most difficult problems to overcome. These logistic problems would need to be contended with 5 times a year as opposed to 4 times a year under the four quarter plan.

A revision of the Dade County curriculum would be a necessity under the quinmester plan. The cost of this revision is being investigated in light of the fact that curriculum revision is required by both the four quarter plan and the quinmester plan.

The quinmester plan has as its major advantage the potential of curriculum improvement and improved plan utilization with minimal calendar alterations. A pupil not attending a fifth quinmester would attend school for 180 days or the exact length of time presently scheduled within a school year. This plan requires little sociological adjustment and makes attendance during summer school a vehicle for acceleration, as well as remediation and enrichment. The number of pupils failing a year's school work would be reduced considerably and a fifth of the year's work would be repeated instead. Pupils would be given the opportunity to explore various subject areas since a year long course is not involved and the option to take another subject is available within 9 weeks.

Present accreditation standards as to length of school year would be met and no state waiver of length of school year would be required. A common vacation period is proposed in this plan; therefore, family vacations are still possible even with attendance for the fifth quinmester. One major advantage of the quinmester plan is that it can be planned in conjunction with the ten hour day Plan and the restructuring of grade level plan.

The quinmester plan does not provide immediate relief in the area of plant utilization. Attendance at four summer quinmesters would be required for a student to accelerate his graduation from senior high school; thus, the plant utilization economies would not be forthcoming until after the fourth year of operation. The community would likely require a period of adjustment and it is not feasible to expect that during the first few summers of operation that 4/5 of the secondary pupils would enroll for the summer quinmester. This proportion of participation is required for the achievement of maximum utilization economies suggested in the plan.

THE GRAND FORKS PROJECT

Dr. Wayne M. Worner

So many of the programs which draw raves in education are, I submit, the product of accident, error, or bad planning.

The ability to convert disaster into victory and salvage pieces of a good plan on the rocks is sometimes pure luck, sometimes good planning, sometimes a matter of how quickly one can react and capitalize on an advantage.

I would submit that of the truly good programs currently operating throughout the country, there are far fewer which are due to sound, careful planning than those which were creature of accident.

More often than not, the educational justification for change is developed after the fact, e.g., middle school, multi-age grouping, ad infinitum. Then often based upon the ex post facto rationale developed, programs are disseminated.

Such is the focus of this presentation, how one school district became involved in the study and development of an extended school year program and ended up with one of the most sophisticated programs of continuous progress operating anywhere in the United States today.

Let me first describe some of the characteristics of our school district and secondly, provide a time frame for the activities surrounding the evolvement of the Grand Forks Learning System.

Grand Forks School District

75 miles

Serves:	Grand Forks Community	1970 population	40,000
	Grand Forks Air Force Base	1970 population	15,000
	Rural Areas -- 100 students		

School Population:

14 elementary schools K-6	6,600
3 junior high schools	2,750
2 senior high schools	2,200
Total	11,550

Economy:

agricultural, processing,
University of North Dakota (8,000 enrollment)
service area
S.A.C. military installation

Student Characteristics:

Ethnic Background - Scandanavian, German, 4% non-white

Academic

students high achievers ITBS - ITLD - 75%ile - 90%ile

ACT - 22-23 average

3-5 merit scholarship finalists per year

3%-5% dropout rate

School District Characteristics

enrollment: 11,550

annual budget: $7,900,000

cost per pupil: $ 685.00 (excludes construction) (bonded indebtedness)

value per pupil: $2,800.00

converted to full value: $22,400

school mill levy:	actual	full value comp.
local operating	96	12.0
sinking & interest (bond. ret.)	14	1.75
building (current)	10	1.25
special assessment	2	.25
county ed. levy	21	2.63
	143	17.88

staff:	
525	professional
50	teacher aides
80	custodial - maintenance
75	clerical
75	food service
805	total

The Grand Forks Plan

In the fall of 1968, following the annual analysis of census data and a report to the School Board which outlines the magnitude of facilities requirements for the next five years, board members directed the school administration to develop a report which would deal with the options available to meet increasing enrollment. School administrators developed a position paper entitled "A Time For Direction--A Time For Change", which considered three options, (a) split shifting, (b) construction of facilities and (c) an extended school year plan.

It should be noted that the school administration from the beginning rejected any modification of the school year which would simply reshuffle the same numbers of students in different time blocks, e.g., any four quarter program or rotation of students in a program which revolved on the teacher's ability "to put it all together." This decision was based upon three considerations: (a) logistics, in order to schedule efficiently, school sizes would, of necessity, have to be large enough to guarantee one section operating per quarter or approximately 120 students per grade. This condition could not be met. (b) Any program which selectively excluded students for three months in the cold winters of North Dakota and placed them in schools during the summer months was considered politically unrealistic. (c) Given the efforts of the school district to promote flexibility in programming and individualization of instruction, we rejected the quarter concept as one which would probably retard the development of those efforts and carry us in the direction of chopping the already too sacred year-units into year-grade quarter units.

The working paper then, suggested consideration of an E.S.Y. program only if the program could be based upon a curriculum which was completely individualized. In that way students could come and go without restriction, and the question of student scheduling and calendar was reduced to minimum priority. In other words, if students really could start exactly where they were when they last attended, time would not be a consideration.

The Grand Forks School Board was sufficiently interested in the paper to direct the formation of a community advisory committee and the development of a feasibility study for Board consideration.

At this point, school administrators analyzed the project as (1) an exercise in long-range planning and probably frustration, and (2) an excellent opportunity to focus attention on the merits of continuous progress as an instructional strategy with community leaders and School Board members.

Sixty days later, after considerable data gathering and discussion, the community advisory committee was asked to prepare a report to the School Board outlining their feelings as to the desirability and workability of an extended school year program in Grand Forks.

The committee presented a report to the Board which unanimously supported the concept of continuous progress and also suggested further serious consideration of an extended school year plan as a solution to the facilities problem.

This report was, to say the least, somewhat disconcerting to the School Board which had already received a petition asking that the study be terminated prior to the filing of a report. As you might expect, much speculation was voiced as to the motivation behind the study, i.e., a subtrefuge to "scare the public" into voting additional funds for needed facilities, and an effort by the superintendent to "build a name" thus permitting him to move to a bigger and better position.

The recommendation from the administration to the Board following the neutral to favorable committee report was to approve a pilot elementary project with the program made available to parents and students who would volunteer. The proposal was heard and accepted by the School Board in early February and plans were quickly developed to operate a pilot project elementary school for 440 students in the fall of 1969.

Within two weeks the city Catholic School Board announced plans to close their city junior and senior high school programs at the close of the 1968-69 school year. This action had the effect of immediately reordering the priority of needs within the school district and created an instant crisis in terms of housing junior high school students in the district.

After considering the various options for housing students and recognizing that the resources tentatively allocated for operating the pilot school E.S.Y. program would no longer be available, school officials contacted representatives of the Grand Forks Air Base to discuss the possibilities of operating the E.S.Y. program on base during the 1969-70 school year.

Following a discussion with commanders on base, in which the comments ranged from neutral to highly favorable, the administrators prepared an implement recommendation for the Grand Forks School Board.

It appeared as though the recommendation would solve several pressing problems:
a. junior high school facilities problems would be solved
b. the pilot project (although expanded substantially) would be operational
c. students residing on the Grand Forks Air Force Base (a highly mobile and transient population) would have much greater opportunity for 180 days of instruction and an opportunity to learn under the direction of some of the finest staff members in the district utilizing the most up-to-date curriculum, technology, and resources available.

E.S.Y. Program in Grand Forks
I. Decision made March 1, 1969
II. Decision reconsidered March 26, 1969
III. Decision reversed April 9, 1969

This brief set of dates represents the beginning and end points of the most sophisticated and well conceived E.S.Y. proposal ever developed.

This, too, might well be the end of the report, however, I believe that what followed the activities in the spring of 1969 is perhaps more important than what did not happen at that time.

Remember, if you will, the motivation behind the original working paper was twofold: (1) that the school district consider the options to additional construction, and (2) that the concept of continuous progress be discussed, publicized and hopefully, be adopted, as an instructional strategy for the school district.

On April 11, 1969, just two days after the coup de grace had been administered to the E.S.Y. proposal, the Grand Forks School Board reaffirmed their support of a planned expenditure of $175,000 for the development of a continuous progress curriculum.

On May 28, the Board also approved the inclusion of items in the next year's budget sufficient to guarantee the organization and operation of "islands of continuous progress" at all grade levels in the school district. "Islands of CPE" is the acronym given to instructional units in which the Grand Forks Learning System is fully operational. That is to say, these areas include utilization of the nearly 12,000 learning packages which have been developed by staff employed in the district, by teams of personnel organized into differentiated staffs, operating in large open physical environments.

During the 1969-70 school year, over 1,000 students participated in instructional programs of the "islands". Initial evaluation of the 6-7 islands suggested the viability of the program and suggested their expansion during the 1970-71 school year. Today, over 2,500 students participate in the C. P. E. program (60-100% of their program can be described as Grand Forks Learning System). Nearly 5,000 students have had some opportunity to work with certain components on a limited basis.

During the last sixty days, the School District's Management Team consisting of central office administrators, coordinators, and building principals has recommended expansion of the program to include all schools. If approved, all nineteen schools will develop and implement the learning systems in mathematics (grades K-12) prior to the start of the 1971-72 school year.

In this way all 12,000 students will be enrolled in a program of continuous progress in a major curriculum area with other major areas scheduled to begin in subsequent years.

What is the significance of the Grand Forks Learning System and how does it relate to contemporary educational trends?

cost
student achievement
accountability
E. S. Y.

The Grand Forks Learning System is a system which looks upon the E. S. Y. concept as one dimension of one component of a system. It views time as a tool, to be used to accomplish ends and very much inter-related with other components. We do not view E. S. Y. as a desirable or undesirable trait, but one which we can now master.

A FEASIBILITY STUDY IN SASKATOON, SASKATCHEWAN

Glen H. Penner

Unlike most school systems which investigate the feasibility of rescheduling their school year, the Saskatoon Public School System is not faced with any pressing needs which rescheduling could overcome. In fact, there are a number of factors which seem to militate against the need for rescheduling the school year in Saskatoon. These include:

1. Climatic conditions in Saskatchewan are such that the school year as presently structured is conducive to the life-style of most parents. Because the summer is relatively short, most parents want to have their children free during July and August. To compel families to take their vacation at times other than in the summer would require a great deal of justification. Although more and more people are taking advantage of winter activities or travel south for a winter vacation, the majority of people are committed to holidaying during the summer and expect their children to be out of school at that time.

2. The use of schools the year-round is hampered by the fact that, with the exception of portions of some collegiates, no schools in the public school system are air conditioned. Although education during the summer does not have to take place in air conditioned buildings, such learning is facilitated if classrooms are not extremely warm.

3. Because the Canadian school year is 200 days, as compared to 180 days in the United States, the scope for increased utilization of school facilities through year-round attendance is limited.

4. The need to utilize school buildings to a greater extent in order to accommodate more students and forestall future school construction is not a crucial problem in Saskatoon. Present student enrollments, as has been noted, are relatively stable. Although additional classrooms and other facilities are needed, especially in some parts of the city, it is not beyond the ability of the school system to provide these facilities, especially if it receives some financial consideration from the provincial government.

5. The desire to reschedule the school year for curricular reasons has not apparently been felt. The semester system, recently introduced into most collegiates, has tended to breathe some new life into the high school program. Although the need has been expressed to develop courses particularly geared to the five-month semester, this need would not necessarily be satisfied by rescheduling the school year.

6. The need to provide increased opportunities for learning during the summer is difficult to assess. Although there was a positive response to the outdoor education program held during the summer of 1970 for elementary age youngsters, that response may not be indicative of a general desire for more summer programs.

If there are apparently so many reasons adversely affecting the need for rescheduling the school year in Saskatoon, the question can legitimately be asked-why bother?

1. There is little need to document the financial difficulties in which education finds itself. Once considered to be the priority item as far as provincial and local governments were concerned, it is now having to justify its existence and fight for its place among other services which are equally deserving. Increasing costs, sometimes without concomitant increases in quality, and a reluctance on the part of taxpayers to support additional expenditures, have forced policy-makers to seek ways to alleviate the situation.

2. As well as being prompted by economic considerations, this study is based on the premise that changes in the organization of the school year can result in educational advantages. There has been an assumption on the part of most people that the present pattern of school attendance is about as good as it can be. The fact that all students are in school at the same time, the two-month vacation in the summer, having all teachers teach the same number of days--these features of the present system have become fundamental in our thinking about education. Yet these features have been challenged by the realization that education is a continuous affair rather than something which begins in September and ends in June, that much valuable instructional time is lost through examinations in June and review in September, that not having all students in school at one time can allow the school to modify its methods of instruction, and that contract periods of different lengths can be advantageous for teachers.

3. Finally, it should be noted that rescheduling the school can be in response to the changing life-styles of people in the community. Although for most people the present school year is conducive to their activities and their way of life, there is a minority who would like to see some flexibility incorporated into the organization of the school year.
   --parents who are not able to get away during the summer and who would like to have their children free from school at other times
   --high school students who would like to be out of school to work or travel at times other than the summer months
   --employers who would prefer to spread their holiday periods over the whole year rather than concentrating them in July and August
   --teachers who would like to be able to teach the year-round in order to earn more money or to take educational leave in the future

These, then, are some of the general factors which a rescheduling of the school year should take into account. All of them have been considered in formulating approaches to rescheduling the school year and in assessing the feasibility of these approaches. In addition, the particular needs of the Saskatoon Public School System have been considered in this study.

The feasibility study involved the following aspects: (1) Creating awareness and interest in the rescheduled school year, (2) Developing approaches to rescheduling the school year in Saskatoon, and (3) Assessing the feasibility of the approaches.

The 4-4-2-2 plan is the most elaborate of the Divided Year approaches we examined. One of its prime advantages is that it increases the number of entry and exit points for students, thus accommodating employment, placement in institutions of higher learning, academic recovery after illness or failure, and transfer from other school systems. Like the summer school approach, the 4-4-2-2 plan does not allow for maximum utilization fo school facilities year-round.

Under the 4-4-2-2- plan the school year would be organized into four semesters consisting of two four-month semesters and two two-month semesters. Classes would begin at the regular time in September and end about December 22 for Semester 1. Examinations would be written toward the end of the term with results being available for the start of Semester 2. Semester 2 would begin in the early part of January and would conclude about the end of April. Semester 3 would include most of May and June, while Semester 4 would include most of July and August.

Advantages of the 4-4-2-2- plan are as follows:

1. The plan provides for all the advantages of semesterizing the high school program and having the end of the first semseter coincide with the Christmas break.

2. It leaves the school year unchanged for those committed to a September to June pattern of attendance.

3. It does, however, provide the possibility of students being out of school during May and June, if not at other times of the year.

4. More entry and exit points are available for students coming into and leaving the high school program.

5. The plan provides for an orderly release of students into the work force three or four times during the year, rather than the main influx being at the end of June.

6. It incorporates summer school into the regular program, thus enhancing the statue of learning during the summer months.

7. It facilitates the enrichment and diversification of a student's program through the provision of classes not usually offered as part of the regular program.

8. It allows students who would like to accelerate their program, and who are advised to do so, to complete high school in less than four years.

9. It produces a potential for economic savings which would result if a significant number of students were in high school fewer than 800 days.

10. It would enable students to work at times when employment was more readily available than during July and August. For example, a high school student might find it advantageous to work from September to December after university students had gone back to classes.

11. It would provide for fewer dropouts because of short-term goals and the opportunity to work and go to school.

12. It would provide for students who experienced a prolonged illness to continue their studies.

13. It would increase the opportunities for students who had previously left school to return and complete subjects they needed in a relatively short period.

14. It would enable students to make more decisions about their own education, thus better preparing them for the knid of situation many of them face at the university level.

15. It facilitates the offering of a greater variety of courses than is often possible in the regular program of most high schools, thus furthering one of the major objectives of the Division IV program.

Some disadvantages of the 4-4-2-2 plan are as follows:

1. Condensing courses originally intended for ten months into periods of four months and two months may be unrealistic, if not educationally unsound.

2. The plan is more complex and potentially disruptive than other divided year plans, thus requiring greater planning, organization, and coordination on the part of administrators.

3. An involved summer school program could add 10 to 15 percent more in operating costs unless judicious use of teachers for Semester 3 and 4 was employed.

4. The operation of Semester 4 in non air-conditioned schools could be a problem in terms of learning unless adjustments were made.

The main purpose of the 4-4-2-2- plan is to improve the educational opportunities provided students. It is not intended to result in a substantial saving of educational dollars, to use school buildings every day of the year, or to accelerate students through high school so that they may graduate early.

The 802 plan requires that all students in an attendance area be placed in one of five groups. At any time only four of these groups would be in school, so that by using the schools the year-round the utilization factor is increased by twenty percent. The plan derives its name from the fact that each group attends school for eight weeks and is off for two weeks, attends eight weeks and if off for two, throughout the year. In addition, students in all attendance groups would get a four-week vacation some time between the first of June and the end of September. Under this plan most students would attend 193 days and be off for 67 days.

In order for this plan to operate in Saskatoon public schools and collegiates, the following steps would have to be taken:

1. Attendance areas around elementary schools would have to be redrawn so that some schools which were not overcrowded could accommodate more students by enlarging their attendance area, some schools which were overcrowded could leave their boundaries unchanged and eliminate some portable classrooms, some schools which were overcrowded could accommodate students bused to them from other parts of the city, some schools could leave their boundaries unchanged and free classroom space for other purposes, and some schools could be phased out of existence and have their students attend other schools.

2. Once the new attendance boundaries had been established, the attendance areas around each elementary school would be divided into five parts so that approximately one-fifth of the students would be in each subdivision. Students in each of these subdivisions would constitute an attendance group. Dividing the attendance area geographically would ensure that all children in the same family would be in the same attendance group. This procedure would also determine the attendance groups for high school purposes, although the attendance areas for each collegiate would be larger. The determination of attendance groups would need to be coordinated centrally.

3. Because attendance groups are determined on the basis of geographic areas, they would each contain students from all grade levels. Attempting to organize these students into classes would be considerably more complicated than at present, since attendance groups would be changing every eight weeks. To facilitate the coordination of classes, each teacher would be assigned to an attendance group and follow the same holiday pattern as students.

Some advantages of the 8-2 plan are as follows:

1. Implementation of the plan under present circumstances would mean that the over-crowding in some schools could be alleviated, portable classrooms could be dispensed with, classroom space could be used for resource centers and other types of facilities, additional classrooms would not have to be built immediately to accommodate incoming students, and some less functional schools could be eliminated. In come cases this would require the alteration of attendance boundaries, the need for pupil transportation services, and the expense of redecoration.

2. Families who could not formerly take a vacation during the winter would have their children out of school for at least two weeks at times other than July and August.

3. The concept of continuous progress would be facilitated by means of a school year in which students were never away from school longer than one month.

4. More flexible contractual arrangements for teachers could be achieved if not all teachers followed the same attendance pattern as students.

5. The business community would be less restricted in the times it could assign vacations for its employees. The fact that this is not presently seen to be a problem by employers would qualify this advantage of the plan.

6. Criticism that schools were left idle for two months of the year would be alleviated.

Some disadvantages of the 8-2 plan are as follows:

1. The major purpose of utilizing school the year-round that of maintaining current levels of expenditure or of saving money, is not achieved with the 8-2 plan. The costs of operating the Saskatoon Public School System under the 8-2 plan would be greater than the costs of using the traditional school year. Even when the expenses of pupil transportation and air conditioning are not considered, it is estimated that the costs of year-round utilization of the schools would be higher than at present. Although potential savings are greater if student enrollment is increasing, the economic advantages of the 8-2 plan, even assuming twenty percent more students, are not significant.

2. The administration of the 8-2 plan would be much more complicated than the administration of the traditional school year. Under any plan in which students are rotated throughout the year, rather than all being in school at one time, there are going to be difficulties in the coordination of students and teachers.

3. The life-styles of most people in the community would be seriously affected by the implementation of the 8-2 plan. Because the traditional school year has been with us for so long, people have come to structure their lives around it. Any plan which departs as significantly from the traditional school year as does the 8-2 plan would require considerable adjustment on the part of many people. If those people cannot see any valid reason for having to make that adjustment, they are going to resist it.

4. Educationally, the 8-2 plan has considerable disadvantages. Because school facilities are being used the year-round, students would not be able to attend more than the minimum number of days. This would restrict opportunities for the kind of remediation, interest, and acceleration presently possible through the provision of summer school. The possibility of students in the lower grades having many different teachers throughout the year could be disconcerting to some children. Programming of students into classes, especially in smaller schools, would be more difficult since not all students are in school at the same time. The 8-2 plan is not conducive to high school courses as presently constituted. nor does it lend itself to the semester system.

5. The lives of students and teachers could be adversely affected by the 8-2 plan. Collegiate students could not work for more than four weeks at a time during the summer. Their extra-curricular activities could be disrupted because not all students would be available for participation. Teachers would be unable to attend summer school or travel extensively if they were on the same holiday pattern as students.

Feasibility study conclusions are:

1. The 8-2 plan for rescheduling the school year is not feasible under the present circumstances in Saskatoon. It would cost more money to operate than the present school year, and would incur considerable resistance on the part of most parents, teachers, students, and administrators.

2. The 4-4-2-2- plan for rescheduling Saskatoon Collegiates contains many features considered desirable for high school students. Because the plan is more difficult to administer and more complicated to implement, it is receiving less attention on the part of collegiate personnel than either the Divided Year Plan or the Lethbridge Plan.

3. Both the Divided Year Plan and the Lethbridge Plan are feasible for Saskatoon if they are approved by the Department of Education. Because it requires a thirty minute addition to the length of the school day during the first term, the Lethbridge Plan would require adjestments in the scheduling of classes not needed with the Divided Year Plan.

4. For a number of reasons, the summer school program for collegiate studies is meeting the needs of fewer and fewer students. Unless it alters its approach and updates its purpose, it will continue to decline in enrollment.

5. Determining what kind of summer program is most conducive to the needs of high school students is extremely difficult. The kinds of classes which, on the basis of student opinion, would seem to be most attractive are very difficult to implement.

6. There appears to be considerable scope for the expansion of summer programs for elementary school children. This is based on a generally favorable attitude to summer school on the part of parents, combined with the success of the two programs recently offered.

7. The traditional school year has had a tremendous conditioning effect on the pattern of living of most people intimately associated with it. Attempting to modify the school year too drastically will be strongly opposed unless there are exteremely justifiable reasons for doing so.

8. Although the majority of people have geared their life style to the school year as it presently exists, there is a minority who would like to see more flexibility incorporated into the organization of the school year.

9. Any plan which would allow parents some choice in the times their children will be in school will cost more money and increase administrative complexities.

10. As long as professional salaries constitute almost 70 percent of the operating expanses of a school system, the scope for saving money through increased utilization of school facilities is limited. The possibilities of realizing economic savings are greater where optimum conditions, such as maximum enrollment and air conditioning, are met.

As a result of this study, it is recommended:

1. That the Saskatoon Public School Board offer a more extensive and diversified summer school program based on the need for remediation, enrichment, and acceleration evident on the part of Saskatoon students.

2. That summer classes be of two types: those initiated by central office personnel and those proposed by teachers, principals, and others, which are approved for presentation.

3. That the provision of summer programs be facilitated through the appointment of a director of summer school, a critical review of summer school courses for collegiate students, a greater financial commitment to summer programs, and consideration of the suggestions made with regard to summer school in chapter four.

4. That the Department of Education reconsider its policy of not providing grants for classes offered at summer school. Certain inconsistencies related to this policy are becoming increasingly evident.
   (a) If students who fail a class during the year repeat it in a semester, they pay no tuition fee, since the cost of providing the class they failed is assumed by the school system. But if they decide to repeat the class they failed by going to summer school, they are charged a tuition fee of at least $25.00.
   (b) If students take classes at summer school and apply them to their regular program, they have to pay a tuition fee for each class taken. If by doing this, however, they are able to leave high school half way through their final year because they have acquired the classes needed for graduation (assuming they attended a semesterized high school), they can presumably save the school system over $500.00 (based on current per pupil costs for collegiate students). If the practice becomes more common for Division IV students to leave high school without having attended three years because they have completed the minimum number of required classes, then the basis of providing grants for the education of such students might well be based on the number of classes taken rather than the number of days attended. If this were the case, it would be inconsistent not to provide grants for classes taken at summer school.

5. That before any decision is made about moving the school year ahead to accommodate collegiates on the semester system, a visit should be made to Lethbridge to discover directly how their divided year plan is functioning. If they are as satisfied with their plan as it is claimed, then it should not be overlooked by collegiate personnel who would like to see the end of the first semester coincide with the Christmas break.

6. That any alteration to the opening and closing dates of school resulting from the institution of a divided year plan apply to all schools in the Public School System.

Board have a heating and cooling system that will permit an ideal thermal environment regardless of outside conditions. Whether or not such schools will be used extensively during July and August, it will be a sound investment in terms of the future utilization of facilities to have all new schools air conditioned.

7. That all new school facilities to be build by the Saskatoon Public School
8. That consideration be given to air conditioning present school facilities over a five or six year period so that the feasibility of a year-round plan for rescheduling the school year might be enhanced.

THE ST. CHARLES PROJECT

Alan M. O'Dell

St. Charles County is adjacent to St. Louis County on the eastern side of the State of Missouri. The City of St. Charles is approximately 20 to 25 minutes from downtown St. Louis. This fact is basic to the problem that made it necessary to investigate year-round concepts and finally implement them within the Francis Howell School District.

Let me give you some idea of the history and the background of the year-round school plan in our school district, tell you something about the details of our plan as opposed to some others, give you some information concerning scheduling (teacher scheduling particularly), discuss the rationale for our plan, talk about some of the interesting things happening at the present time, and tell you about things that will be taking place in the near future and somewhat further beyond the near future. We'll also take just a moment to talk about the gratifying and somewhat overwhelming response we've had from the community and outside the community regarding our 9-3 plan.

In St. Louis and St. Charles Counties, the most usual solution to the critical growth problem with many districts has been to inaugurate a plan for double or split sessions. It had been assumed by most parents, teachers, and administrators in Francis Howell School District that the same solution would be applied when necessary. In spring and summer 1968, some detailed discussions began to take place as to how best to implement a double sessions program within the district. It had been made known to us in many and various ways that out parents did not like the idea of double sessions because they all, of course, had friends who had experienced this type of schedule in the City of St. Charles or in adjoining districts in St. Louis County. We found that the major problem we were encountering when discussing split sessions was the shape and size of the school district. Francis Howell District is approximately 30 miles in length, encompassing a total of about 150 square miles. It became apparent that on a double session schedule some of our youngsters would be boarding buses to come to school at or before 5:00 a.m. in the morning. Some of our junior high people would be getting home from school between 7:30 and 8:00 p.m. in the evening.

In the late summer of 1968, during one of our principals' meetings, the assistant principal of the junior high school suggested that instead of split sessions we plan to operate school year-round. Those of us who had any knowledge of year-round plans (and there was little knowledge among the group) thought of year-round school as the, what we would call, the four-quarter plan, whereby one-fourth of the students have spring as their vacation, one-fourth have summer as their vacation, one-fourth have winter as vacation. A little research indicated that the great problem with this plan in some places had been the fact that one-fourth of the students must have a winter vacation which is rather undesirable. It was felt that our community would violently oppose this type of year-round schedule. Somewhat later Mr. John Anderson, who was the assistant principal in junior high school, again brought up the subject of year-round school, but suggested it on the basis of the nine week-three week plan as we have adopted it. It appeared to us that this year-round school plan, with each youngster having three weeks off in each season of the year, would be less detrimental for the Francis Howell School District than split sessions. By early fall 1968, many of the rudimentary plans had been worked out and meetings were held with parents to inform and to obtain attitudes toward the year-round idea. We also sent letters home and mailed brief questionnaires to parents who were unable to attend meetings to get a cross section of the attitude of our community.

Somewhat surprisingly, we found that over 60 per cent of our parents indicated they would approve of the year-round plan over split sessions and were willing to begin the year-round plan in one of our elementary attendance areas for a trial period. It is interesting to note that throughout the almost two years now that the year-round plan has been in operation in Francis Howell District, very little change in the 60 per cent to 65 per cent favorable attitude has been noted. In the two or three questionnaires that have followed, plus the other investigative methods used each time a meeting is held or questionnaire or opinionnaire is mailed out, we find that around 60 per cent to 65 per cent of the people indicate a positive reaction toward year-round school. I would hasten to add that some of the positive reaction is less positive than others and, of course, much of the negative reaction is less negative. I would estimate that only about 5 per cent of our parents are intensely dissatisfied with the year-round schedule.

After we determined that our parents would support the schedule, the administration of the district began some rather detailed planning. By early 1969 our School Board indicated they would desire to see a detailed plan showing how the plan would operate and instructed the administration to construct this model.

The youngsters in the year-round school attendance area are divided into four groups, basically equal in numbers, simply referred to as Cycles A, B, C, and D. The attendance area is divided geographically so that students from the same family and generally from the same subdivision are on the same cycle. Actually, since 24 bus routes served the year-round school under its traditional set-up, we simply put six bus routes on each cycle and on the year-round basis 18 of these routes operate daily and six of them do not. At all times three cycles, then, are in school and one is on vacation. Another factor that was taken into consideration in determining the cycle areas was the stability of each area. Many of our subdivisions are growing rapidly and are rather new, whereas other subdivisions are extremely stable and have reached their growth potential. It became very obvious to us that in order to maintain the rate of growth in each of the cycles it would be necessary for us to have the same amount of growing areas in each cycle. At the present time our basic assumption has been valid and the cycles are growing at generally the same rate. However, we feel that possibly by the summer of 1972, a major recycling effort may have to take place because the number of students in each cycle may begin to vary too much.

Another interesting challenge in developing the year-round schedule was scheduling the teachers. For all practical purposes there are two basic kinds of teaching schedules. Most of our teachers have chosen to teach on the same schedule as students attend school. In other words, they teach for nine weeks and they then have a three week vacation. This procedure repeated four times during the year is the same number of teaching days as under the traditional schedule with the exception that it takes a twelve month period to teach that number of days rather than nine months in succession. Secondly, we have full time teachers, which means that for nine, eleven, or even possibly twelve months a teacher is in the classroom with no three week breaks interspersed, with the exception of the basic vacations when the school is closed (Christmas, Easter, Washington's Birthday, teachers' meetings, etc.). The nine week-three week teachers stay with the same group of students throughout the year, whereas the full time teachers switch groups of students as one group goes on vacation and another group returns from vacation. Full time teachers switch from the group ending a session to the group beginning a session. To be quite honest, we have seen some difficulties in the full time type of schedule and the next school to be put on the year-round schedule, which is Central Elementary School, will have only nine week-three week teaching schedules. Central Elementary School, by the way, begins its year-round operation July 1, 1971. The full time teaching position has not been eliminated at Becky-David School, but the program at the school has been revised and revamped extensively to the point that the organization of the Intermediate area so the school is somewhat departmentalized in order to overcome the disadvantages of youngsters changing teachers each nine weeks under the self-contained classroom set-up.

You might be interested in the contract arrangements with teachers. Our basic contract for a teacher is figured on 185 days. One hundred seventy-four of these are teaching days, the remainder are holidays: professional meeting days such as State Teachers Meeting, County Teachers Workshops, etc.; parent-teacher conference day; and work days when the teacher is at school but students are not in session. In order to determine the contract for a teacher who is teaching more than 185 days, one would merely divide the teacher's basic 185 day contract by 185 to find a daily rate. For instance, if it were determined that a teacher's daily rate were $30.00 and the teacher was working 190 days, then $30.00 would be multiplied by five and $150 would be added to the basic contract.

Francis Howell School District is a very poor district. Our valuation per student is approximately $6,000 which is about 60 per cent of the Missouri State average. In the State of Missouri, the bonding capacity of a school district is limited to 10 per cent of the district's valuation. These facts combined with the extremely rapid growth of our student population has made providing classrooms at the rate needed to keep abreast of our growth a very difficult problem, the approximate cost per classroom and supportive facilities being from $20,000 to $25,000. The year-round schedule at Becky-David School which provided about 15 classrooms constituted a saving in building of over $300,000. It is estimated that air conditioning Becky-David School will cost much less than $100,000, which means a net saving in Capital Outlay of about $200,000. Investigation into other areas of the school budget can give no quantitative or statistical evidence that the year-round school is an economical measure. We have from time to time and from place to place been told by those who are fanatically in favor of year-round education that our savings are tremendous. The completely practical response I am forced to make to this observation is that it just has not happened.

The basic reason, then, that the year-round schedule was implemented in the Francis Howell School District was the mere fact that the schedule added one-third more classroom capacity to any given building. Our purpose was certainly not a noble one. It was not dollar economy. For want of a better term, it was "space economy". Many of our faculty members hold that the elimination of the traditional summer three-month forgetting period is a positive result of the year-round schedule. A good many of our parents state that the vacation cycle change has provided them time for seasonal vacations. It has allowed them an opportunity to take vacations at some other time than the summer vacation and do some other kinds of things.

Negative responses have been varied. However, I suspect the most usual negative response has been from parents who have youngsters in junior and senior high school as well as in the elementary school, and therefore the family lives on two school schedules. It is hoped that soon the entire district can be shifted to the year-round schedule. There is no date set for this total implementation but with our continued growth it will no doubt be soon. I would unhappily add that without a change in the fiscal structure of our district or the State of Missouri itself, we may one day find ourselves with year-round school and split sessions.

It seems to me that considering the kind of attention that Francis Howell School District has been given, it is likely that a nationwide movement toward year-round education is in progress. We are gratified by the response from our local news sources and by the editorial support given to us by the newspapers as well as the excellent coverage in local radio and television. We have been horrored and somewhat mystified at articles appearing in newspapers and magazines throughout the country.

NORTHVILLE YEAR-ROUND PROJECT

Raymond E. Spear and Earl Busard

The problems to be overcome in Northville included changing the community vacation and living patterns, overcoming the many and varied misconceptions as well as misinformation associated with the extended school year concept, and planning the scheduling of extra-curricular activities and year-round recreation programs within the community. We had to decide whether an extended school year only in Northville could have effect on real estate values. We wanted to establish a school calendar which offered educational opportunity, economic efficiency, and acceptability to the community. There was our inability to guarantee every aspect of an extended school year prior to actual implementation, difficulties in establishment of acceptable neighborhood attendance areas and determining the desirability or necessity of air conditioning in all school buildings.

The benefits of the year-round school: It provides an opportunity for more relevant learning experiences to meet the needs of individual students; an opportunity to utilize expanded vocational education to enhance the educational process; four kindergarten admission dates, better timed to enable children to enter school when they are ready. With only one-fourth of the students on vacation at one time, there should be more employment opportunity, less social unrest. Year-round or employment options for teachers will provide instructional continuity. Family vacation planning will be more flexible.

Our presently fully utilized buildings will educate one-third more pupils. This will lead to a reduction of future building requirements and save on construction needs, additional staff, maintenance and interest costs. There will be a better use of teaching supplies and equipment and less property for school sites will be removed from the tax rolls.

Yes...year-round school is feasible in Northville! It will enable our school district to provide expanded, more efficient educational opportunities for all of our youngsters. It will allow the school district to spend less on buses, beans and buildings, and more on the education of the individual child, which, after all, is what it's all about. It will mean fewer buildings to build, staff, operate and maintain...an eventual savings of millions of dollars which, otherwise, would have to come from additional tax levies. All conversion costs would be covered by state and/or federal agencies.

Northville's study of year-round school--specifically the four-quarter plan--shows that all of this is feasible in Northville. It is possible...with another big IF. Will the citizens of Northville accept year-round school...a new school calendar, one which to many will mean new patterns in their everyday living....namely varied vacation periods? That's the purpose of continuing the study...Phase III...to find out if the four-quarter plan is acceptable in Northville. Like other states, Michigan has faced the question of how to provide better educational opportunity to students and still keep pace with the spiraling costs of building and operating schools.

State funds were granted to Northville, Ann Arbor, Freeland, Port Huron, Utica, and the Okemos-East Lansing-Haslett tridistrict, for feasibility studies of the extended school year. These districts are typical examples of a large number of school districts with similar problems.

Northville seemed an ideal community to focus its study on the four-quarter plan. Under the four-quarter system, each student would be assigned three 60-day instructional periods and one 60-day vacation quarter. This part of the project--Phase II--offered each citizen the opportunity to first read about the year-round school study in a newsletter, "Opening School Doors", distributed on a community-wide basis.

Then, a detailed explanation of how the four-quarter plan would work was prepared in a filmstrip presentation and shown to groups throughout Northville. Questions and answers most often discussed at these public meetings were later published in the Northville Record.

Major advantages and drawbacks of the four-quarter plan, as explained in the filmstrip, were listed in a pamphlet which was distributed at film presentations and mailed directly to citizens of the community. We tried to provide everyone an opportunity to become fully informed about year-round school, especially parents, staff, students and business... those who would be most affected by the four-quarter plan.

Surveys and questionnaires were carefully prepared and distributed to these four groups because their opinions would furnish the data to help us answer that question, "Is it feasible?" Fifty per cent of Northville parents with one child and 50 per cent of those parents with more than one child were asked about their attitudes toward year-round school. Their answers lend support to the statement that year-round school is feasible--possible--full of potential in Northville. Sixty-seven and six tenths per cent of the parents surveyed feel that year-round school would make better use of our existing school buildings. An equal number revealed that they would favor year-round school, even if it meant some inconvenience, if such a program would bring about improved educational opportunity for children.

More than half of those surveyed said they would favor year-round school if it would save money--even if it meant putting up with some inconvenience. By removing the overlap in these groups, it was determined that 77 per cent of the respondents indicated they would favor year-round school if it improved educational opportunity AND saved money. Mothers, who without question would be one of the most affected by the four-quarter plan, indicated their willingness to accept inconvenience if it improved educational opportunity as well as saved tax dollars. And, since over 90 per cent of the respondents said they would be living in Northville in 1973, their opinions and preferences can be considered valid research material.

Northville teachers commented on the strengths and weaknesses of four-quarter school operation and, in a survey of teacher opinion, seven out of ten indicated their support of such a plan...again IF it enhances the educational program and saves money. Students are not so sure. Student opinion surveys reveal their concerns about air conditioning, extra-curricular activity scheduling, and vacation assignments. Business and industry in Northville and surrounding communities strongly supported the potential of more efficient use of school facilities. Over 93 per cent of business respondents said they would be willing to cooperate with the school district in vacation scheduling. Furthermore, three-fourths of those businesses said year-round school operation would offer advantages to their business operation.

Still another opinion survey was the "advisory vote" taken June 8, 1970. At the regular school board election on that date, voters were asked...."If educational and economic advantages become evident, would you cooperate with the Board of Education in implementing a full year (Quarterly Sessions) school program in the Northville Public Schools?" Unfortunately only 17 per cent of the electorate chose to express their opinion in this unofficial poll. Four hundred, twenty-two said yes, while 518 said no. This unofficial poll was not intended to be the determining factor, for or against the year-round schools in Northville. The low voter turnout and the inconsistency between the survey which said "yes" and the advisory poll which said "no" indicates the need for more study...more information. In addition, a great majority of parents and teachers have expressed a desire for more information about the four-quarter plan.

Now, the State Department of Education has asked Northville Schools to begin Phase III of our year-round school study. Phase III poses the question, "Year-round school--is it acceptable?" To find that answer, we must first seek answers to many other questions. Phase II, the feasibility study, told us that parents desire all children in the same family to be on vacation at the same time...and that it is desirable to have all children in the same neighborhood on vacation at the same time. Can parent, student and neighborhood vacation wishes be met? How many families will not be able to have their first or even second vacation preference? How much vacation inconvenience will be acceptable? If the four-quarter plan is unacceptable to some, can vacation and enrollment adjustments be made to satisfy them? Is there a relationship between the age of children and parent acceptability of year-round school? What demands will year-round school place on the recreational facilities of the community? How can we fill the information gap that may still exist about Phase II and, at the same time, inform the public about Phase III?

To meet these needs for continuing information, a four-page supplement was distributed on March 25 in an edition of the Northville Record. The publication reviewed Phase II and outlined the procedures for Phase III. It pointed out to all school families, and to families who will have children in school by 1976, that we will theoretically assign vacation quarters for the next four years....This theoretical vacation assignment is just a test run.

Standards for determining which family gets which vacation quarter when...or which neighborhood gets which vacation quarter when will be established. Families with children who are or will be in school by 1976, will receive a four-year attendance-vacation preference form. A trained team of local citizens will distribute the family schedules for parent comment. The scheduling instruments will then be used to determine how many families accept the vacation schedule, how many accept it in part, and how many find it unacceptable. For those families who find their assigned vacation schedule unacceptable attempts will be made to determine why. Efforts will then be made to make adjustments satisfactory to them, but within the framework of set standards. To be successful, our scheduling "trial balloon" must, on paper, enroll 75 per cent of the student population in school for any given quarter. The remaining 25 per cent will in theory be on vacation.

This much we know...new additions to Main Street Elementary, Moraine Elementary, Amerman Elementary, Cook Junior High School, and Northville High School will temporarily solve the problem of overcrowding. But, housing and population projections show that, by the 1973-74 school year, our schools will again be bulging at the seams.

Even more alarming is the projected school enrollment for 1976. Estimates based on existing housing, current construction, and approved housing projects, show a student population somewhere near 7,000 for 1976...more than double the 3,235 students presently attending Northville schools.

And that's only the beginning! Developers, builders, and home buyers recognize that Northville is an established residential community.

The Board of Education has no intention of making any decision on year-round school until all the facts are in. However, the answer to "Year-round school--is it acceptable?" is information vital to Northville, the State of Michigan as well as many other school districts around the nation.

SLIDING 4-QUARTER PLAN

Dr. Clyde J. Baer

In face of today's need to operate schools year-round, the objectives of the Sliding Four-Quarter Plan are:

1. To make maximum utilization of school plant facilities.
2. To make maximum utilization of the trained professional school staff.
3. To provide more incentives for teachers by year-round employment and higher annual salaries.
4. To keep pace with the rising costs of educating children.
5. To decrease the number of children attending school at any one time, thusly saving plant facilities space, teacher time and educational costs.
6. To broaden the concept of the nature, scope and purposes of public education by broader and more varied instructional programs, working closely with community agencies, and being more cognizant of the needs and trends of living and the local and national scenes.
7. To provide instructional programs to better meet the needs of all children with varying abilities, interests and backgrounds.
8. To encourage better and more flexible instructional programs capable of incorporating modern innovations of flexible and module scheduling, gifted and remedial programs, co-teaching and team-teaching, programmed instruction, ungraded plans, large- and small-group instruction, continuous progress plans, vocational-technical training, instructional television, and other developments.
9. To permit children to graduate from school at an earlier age with a complete education, or permit them to spend more time in school, if needed, and still graduate by age 18.
10. To keep pace with the increasing number of courses and greater bodies of knowledge to teach in a harnessed number of years.
11. To encourage school-community cooperative recreational and vocational programs.

The Sliding Four-Quarter Plan for the Year-Round School has never been formally presented or tried in the country.

Basically, the Plan divides the school year into four quarters of twelve weeks each--fall, winter, spring, and summer quarter. This totals a school year of forty-eight weeks that the schools are in operation. Today, most schools operate for approximately thirty-six weeks each year, arranged into two semesters.

In the four-quarter plan of running schools for forty-eight weeks, the schools are closed for four weeks during the year for maintenance and repair, teacher evaluation and orientation, student programming, personnel assignments, and other necessary tasks. Ideally, one week between each quarter would best permit a systematic arrangement of handling these tasks. However, it might be more appropriate to schedule the four weeks' vacation all at once during one part of the year. This could be arbitrary depending on the desires of the community and parents and the feasibility of the administrative operation of the schools. This writer favors the one week vacation between quarters so that all children in school could count on at least a week's vacation during the summer months to coincide with the family vacation plans.

The children are scheduled to attend school for four consecutive quarters and have a vacation period for one quarter. They are in school for forty-eight weeks, or four quarters, with a week's vacation between each quarter if the vacation periods were so scheduled. At the end of the forty-eight weeks of schooling, the children have a vacation period for one quarter of twelve weeks, plus the two additional weeks between quarters.

At the start of each quarter, only one-fourth of the children enrolled in each grade start school. Another one-fourth of the children in the same grade start school the next quarter, and so forth. By dividing the children of one grade level into four sections and having each section start school at a different quarter, the "sliding" effect for scheduling vacations is achieved. Consequently, with each section attending school for four consecutive quarters of twelve weeks each, each section will have its vacation quarter at a different season of the year.

As an example, if a section begins school in the fall quarter, the section will have its vacation during the following fall quarter. It will return to school for the winter quarter and have its next vacation the following winter quarter. The following year this group of children will have their vacation during the spring quarter, and the following year in the summer quarter.

By having the four sections of each grade rotate their vacation periods each year at different seasonal quarters, there will be equitability as to the time of year, or season, that children receive their vacations. Parents will not be able to complain that their neighbor's child always has vacation during the summer while their own child always has vacation during the winter. This has been an insurmountable problem in the four-quarter plans that have been tried when children attend school for three quarters followed by a vacation quarter.

To further equitablility among families in scheduling children in the various quarters. They are assigned by their family names. In other words, children in the first grade with family names beginning from A to F could start in the fall quarter, from G to L in the winter quarter, from M to R in the spring quarter, and from R to Z in the summer quarter. Chronological age will be a factor in the placement of children to their corresponding grade level. The school officials will have to study their school population to determine alphabetical divisions and equate them with the chronological age factor.

All children of the same family will attend school during the same quarters and have their vacation on the same seasonal quarters, regardless of their grade level. If the last names of children in the same family are different, the last name of the head of the household will be used as the assignment key to insure that all the children of one family have the same vacation quarter. This has been a problem in the few places that have tried the four-quarter plan. Parents were greatly disturbed when their children were scheduled vacations at different seasons of the year so that the whole family could not go on a vacation trip together.

It must be kept in mind that by staggering the enrollment of a given grade level throughout the four quarters and by sliding the vacation periods, only three-fourths of the school population will be in school at any given quarter of the year. It is here that the economy of school plant facilities, teachers and educational costs are apparent. There will be an additional savings by having the children graduate from school one year earlier at approximately age 17 instead of the traditional age 18. The added economic savings is the result of the "sliding" four-quarter plan of having children enrolled in school four consecutive quarters before each vacation quarter. The four-quarter plans previously tried with children enrolled three quarters before their vacation quarter did not possess the feature of advancing through school faster. However, it is important to observe that the Sliding Four-Quarter Plan doesn't make it necessary that a child graduate a year early. The child could, under the Plan, receive an additional year's education and graduate at approximately age 18. He also would have had an additional thirty-six weeks of education above that of the tradional school graduation at age 18. Of course, some of the savings of facility space, teacher time and cost of education would be lost in the Sliding Four-Quarter Plan if the child received the extra thirty-six weeks of education and didn't graduate a year early. However, the enormous savings of having only three-fourths of the children in school at any given time would still exist.

To further explain how the Sliding Four-Quarter Plan permits the children to graduate a year early, compared to the traditional school today, the traditional schedule has to be compared with the schedule of the Plan by weeks. In the traditional schedule of thirty-six weeks each year, the child starting school at age 6 receives four hundred thirty-two weeks of school over a twelve-year period and graduates at age 18. In comparison, a child starting at age 6 in the Sliding Four-Quarter Plan will receive four hundred thirty-two weeks of schooling over an eleven-year period and graduates at age 17. If the child remains in school for twelve years to graduate at age 18, he will have had four hundred sixty-eight weeks of schooling.

Obviously, the students in the Plan graduating a year earlier, with an equivalent amount of education to what he receives under the traditional schedule, could begin his college career, enter a vocational-technical training program, enroll in a junior college, take remedial courses in adult school, or gain employment a year earlier. In respect to students entering college for professional careers, as engineering, medicine, education, etc., the student would graduate a year earlier from college, consequently helping to answer society's demands for professional people. The fact that college courses of study are being extended into more years, like the medical curriculum, places even more importance on speeding up the education process where possible.

The students who are not going to college could start studying for their vocational fields in a vocational-technical school or junior college at age 17 and relieve the regular high schools from having to offer extensive vocational preparation courses. The students needing more remedial general education courses could continue their education in adult classes, while others could secure full-time employment, or both.

It is feasible that by having students graduate a year early, better cooperative school-work programs could be established between business and industry and the adult schools. Business and industry have consistently expressed a need for these kinds of programs to bridge the gap between public schooling and employment.

STATE PROJECT IN BRADFORD COUNTY

C. M. Clark

Bradford County, a ten-school area with a student population of 4,100, conducted a pilot program for the Department of Education extending the basic 180-day school year for students to one of 210 days.

The 30-day extension began July 6, 1970 and extended through August 14, 1970. Programs of instruction were provided from kindergarten through credit courses for senior high school students.

The majority of the instructional program was conducted on Bradford's 88 acre educational park which houses the high school, Middle School, Starke Elementary and the area vocational and technical center. All county schools were in operation during this period of time.

Attendance was elective, a student could attend tuition free if he so chose. Transportation was provided on a countywide basis, and lunch was served in all centers. Although only one cafeteria was in operation, food was transported from this cafeteria to the other schools.

Program structures of all types were offered and tried experimentally. They were nongraded, team teaching, modular, and conventional.

Thirty-six per cent of the Bradford County students in grades K-6 chose to attend the extended year while only one-half of this percentage of high school level students chose to attend. Countywide, 1,072 students attended the extended portion of the school year.

STATE PROJECT IN CLAY COUNTY

Thomas J. Moe

Clay is one of three Florida counties having received state funding to operate an Extended School Year pilot project. Implementation of the pilot took place at the S. Bryan Jennings Elementary School, Orange Park, a school which houses a multitude of innovations in program and building design and serves as an experimental school supported by Title III ESEA.

Jennings Elementary has operated on the philosophy that pupils and teachers differ from one another as well as differing within each self in various areas. Operating on a continuous progress, ungraded design, Jennings Elementary found little difficulty for children, parents, or teachers already accepting the idea of continuous progress in learning.

With a 220 pupil day school year, the average or above average pupil will complete six years work in five years. Children who make less than the average year's growth in a year have 40 days longer annually to complete work usually completed by pupils in one hundred eighty days without the stigma of failure.

The school has operated based upon the philosophy that pupils and teachers differ from one another as well as differing within each self in various areas. The school has recognized that learning proceeds on a continuum and therefore through team-teaching has attempted to provide an ungraded curriculum for all pupils assigned to the school. Moving into a calendar of year-round school based on continuous progress should not present any too serious difficulties for children, parents or teachers who already are most accepting of the idea of continuous progress in learning.

The school staff, and community have accepted the continuous progress plan as "the most sensible" approach to the education of children. With a two hundred twenty (220) pupil day the average or above average pupil could complete six years work in five years. The S. Bryan Jennings Elementary School for the year 1970-71 is scheduled to serve K-5 pupils. During the transition year, sixth year pupils will attend the junior high which will be phasing into a middle school. Thus the K-5 school pupils would have completed K-VI curriculum with no need for expansion of building facilities. Children who make less than average year's growth in a year would have the 40 days longer annually to complete work usually completed by average and above average pupils in one hundred eighty days without the stigma of failure. Current research indicates the improved image and resultant attitude toward self has much more to do with achievement than does native ability. Repetition of a whole year by these pupils is also wasteful of their time and costly in education dollars.

The team-teaching approach to teaching for individualizing instruction makes possible providing for the educational needs of individual pupils.

Research shows that where year round schools have existed the extended year was not injurious to the health of pupils nor to teachers. The same research emphasizes that not more than one year of acceleration for pupils should be planned for in as much as seven years of schooling.

The school has had two very successful sessions of six weeks. The first year the program provided both kindergarten, basic arithmetic, and reading as well as enrichment in the areas of art, music, drama, creative writing, low organization games and sports and library services. The school had an enrollment at the close of the year of approximately 550 pupils. Over 200 of these were transported pupils. Even though no bus service was made available for the summer program, but more than 350 pupils were involved in various phases of the voluntary summer program. During the second summer an enrichment social studies program, "Discovering Our Great America the Beautiful" brought together art, music, geography, history and literature with many real and vicarious (film) field trips. Added to this academic program was a rich library program and family type recreation program. Again more than 75% of the school's pupil population was voluntarily involved even though no transportation could be provided for the more than 200 bus pupils.

PORT HURON'S FOUR-QUARTER FEASIBILITY STUDY

Dr. Sami J. Alam

Reasons for this study in the Port Huron area included increasing enrollment, up six hundred students in past three years (that's twenty classrooms). Furthermore, we expect an increase of three hundred this year (ten classrooms). The pinch is on in both high schools and some of the elementary schools. That's why a proposed bond issue was presented to voters in December last year. Defeat of that bond issue still leaves us with the same problems. That's why PHASC applied for state funds to study the idea of year-round schools-- as one alternative way of providing more classroom space. Forty-eight districts applied and six grants were made.

Our study has a basic goal. We wanted to examine the economic and educational feasibility of the four-quarter plan of school operation for the Port Huron Area School District as a means of responding to our present and anticipated overcrowding problems. The plan selected for further study was one that would meet three criteria: (1) to maintain and/or improve the present educational quality of our programs. (2) to reduce our overcrowding problems. (3) the overall cost of the plan would have to be less than that incurred through additional buildings and sites. This study is a preliminary and tentative one and is offered as a method of meeting the immediate needs of the school district.

We first began this study two years ago. Intensive research began in January, 1969. A state grant was received in April, 1969 for $19,200. We reviewed all of the research and literature in the area of year-round schools, examined the history, types of plans, experimental programs attempted, reviewed results of studies of other school systems.

There are four basic types of four-quarter plans. The first is the complete year plan. Its advantages are an improved educational program with little preparation to implement. Some economy through reduced failures may result. Its disadvantages are it does not reduce space requirements. It costs more than regular school and other quarter plans. There are no summer vacations for anybody.

The quadrimester plan, the second type of four-quarter plan, has two advantages. It provides for curriculum revision and greater flexibility of programs and provides economy by accelerating the achievement so that 13 years of instruction are achieved in 11 years. Its disadvantages are that the plan would not reduce cost for first 5 to 6 years and thus would increase expenses for first 4 to 5 years of operation. The elementary pupils' opportunity to fail is increased by acceleration. Reteaching failed students may increase cost. Type three is the optional vacation plan. Its advantages are that it reduces per pupil cost by reducing space needed. Small, inefficient buildings would be phased out. Area recreation facilities would be less crowded and used all year. Juvenile delinquency could be reduced by having only one quarter of the students on vacation any any time. There would be increased job opportunities for older students. It provides for curriculum revision. Its disadvantage is there is no assurance of even distribution of students among the four quarters and thus the plan may turn out to be costlier than anticipated.

The last basic plan is the assigned vacation. Its advantages are that curriculum revision would provide greater flexibility and individualization of the educational program. Curriculum revision may achieve economy by reducing the cost of reteaching failed students. Economy is achieved with distribution of students' vacations over the four quarters being equal. It increases job opportunities for older students since only one quarter are on vacation at one time. It may reduce juvenile delinquency. Area recreational facilities would be less crowded and used all year. Small buildings would be eliminated and so would overcrowding. Its disadvantages are that the plan may be more costly than the 180 days school year because of increased maintenance costs; operating busses all year, and the employment of staff on overload basis. The community may resist the plan because of the fact that vacations are assigned. There were many questions we sought to answer:

1. What will be the calendar for assigned vacation plan?
2. How may elementary school children be assigned to schools and to classes within the school?
3. Can intermediate school students be scheduled on an assigned vacation plan?
4. Can high school students be scheduled on an assigned vacation plan?
5. What use of the present schools will achieve maximum economy?
6. What professional staff will be needed?
7. What non-professional staff will be needed?
8. Can the school buildings be maintained?
9. What will the cost of maintenance be?
10. Can students be properly transported?
11. What will the cost of transporting students?
12. How will vacations be assigned to staff?
13. How will vacations be assigned to pupils?
14. What changes in purchasing procedures will be needed?
15. How will students coming from other districts be placed and vacation periods assigned?
16. What will be the total cost of the assigned vacation plan?
17. How will business in the Port Huron area react to the assigned vacation plan?
18. What year-round recreation facilities are available in Port Huron?
19. Will the public in the Port Huron area accept the assigned vacation plan?
20. Will the parents of the Port Huron Area School District children accept the assigned vacation plan?

21. Will the staff of the Port Huron Area Schools accept the assigned vacation plan?

Our study constructed a calendar of a four-quarter year, simulated student placement, scheduled a high school and an intermediate school, probed for answers to each of the questions with the people concerned, and compared the cost of operating the school on a regular basis with that of operating it on a four-quarter plan.

The results of this study of the four-quarter plan are as follows: Some curriculum adjustments and revisions are necessary. We need to change semester courses of study into quarter length (90 days into 60 days). Each quarter would become non-sequential as much as possible; that is, it would stand by itself. We made no attempt to prescribe what should be added or taken away from our present curriculum we merely shifted the unit of time for instruction. With less children in school at any one time, our class size would be reduced. This would mean a better pupil-teacher ratio and thus improved instruction. A detailed plan would have to be worked out for curriculum revision. This requires intensive work by teachers, administrators, parents, and board members.

We need equal student enrollment in each of the four quarters, and thus the opportunity to distribute vacation times throughout the school year. Children would not be in school all year long; just three-quarters of the year, as they are now. They will attend three quarters instead of two semesters.

Children from a family would all be assigned to the same vacation quarter. Each parent should be contacted for ranking of their preferences for vacation period and attempts will be made as much as possible to accommodate those parents.

Community acceptance and support would be essential if year-round schools are to be provided. We recognize that changing the school calendar will also affect the community. Recreational activities, after school activities, part-time employment, etc. are all affected. A survey of public reaction will be conducted after informing the community of the study and its details.

Staff acceptance and support is essential if year-round schools are to be realized. It requires a thorough understanding of the proposed four-quarter plan by all staff members. In addition, the assistance and suggestions by PHEA and other employee organization are needed. A survey of the staff will be conducted during the second phase of the study.

The support, assistance, and cooperation of business, industry, and community agencies is required. We need to work closely with business and industry to learn of their vacation policies for employees so these are related to the vacation periods of the schools. Agencies as library, YMCA, Scouts, churches, and parent organizations such as Amateur Hockey Association, Little League, etc. need to be consulted for coordination.

Some improvements would have to be made in some of the schools, including air conditioning of all schools for use during 12 months of the year. A year-round school would require the phasing out of some smaller, less efficient schools. Nine classrooms or less, for example. Several of these schools were to have been phased out, if our December bonding proposal had been approved and new schools built. Parents in each of the attendance areas of schools to be phased out would be consulted in order that they and school staff carefully plan any procedures for phasing out these smaller schools.

Additional operating millage would be required; more than we are now paying but less than that required to build additional schools under our present two semester method of operating school. It will cost a little more to operate schools all year. To maintain schools all year. To operate buses all year. To serve hot lunches all year. To employ staff on overload basis.

Under present financial structure of the State Aid to public schools, it appears that expenses would require 3.89 mills first year (due to costs of installing air conditioning equipment), 2.49 mills each year thereafter (under our present financial structure). On the other hand, it would require an initial 5.1 mills to build the sites and additions needed, and an average of 3.8 mills per year for 30 years to retire a bond issue needed to pay for the needed additons. To this is also added 1.8 mills per year in additional operating costs for those buildings. You can see that it would cost a little more to be less crowded and do a better job for youngsters. But, state school laws and regulations will have to be revised for any schools operating year-round. The 180 day rule, for example. Athletic eligibility rules, for another.

Our school maintenance program will have to be revised as we will not be able to utilize summer months for major repairs and cleaning. This type of preventative mainteance will now have to go on throughout the year after classes are dismissed. Supply storage and distribution will have to be adjusted to this different operation.

In summary, our study indicates that year-round schools (under this proposed four quarter plan) are feasible if the following conditions are met: Curriculum adjustments and revision; equal enrollment in each quarter with opportunity for vacations distributed throughout the year; community acceptance and support; Staff acceptance and support; support and assistance of local business, industry, and community agencies; improvements made in school buildings, including the installation of air conditioning equipment; some additional operating millage; phasing out of smaller, less efficient school buildings; necessary revisions in state school laws and regulations; revised maintenance program for our school buildings.

Our community survey indicated that: 47% of the registered voters favored the four-quarter plan; 37% opposed the plan; 16% did not express an opinion; 89% of the parents picked the summer quarter as their first choice for a vacation.

The certified staff survey showed: 39% of the staff opposed the plan; 35% favored the plan; 26% expressed no opinion; the majority of the staff indicated they would continue to work under the plan; the majority of the staff appeared to prefer a summer quarter for a vacation if given a choice.

Finally, the business and industrial community survey findings indicate representatives were evenly divided in their approval or rejection of the plan.

CONSULTANT OPINION ON YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION

Dr. Thomas E. Putnam

"It is recognized that financial resources...are limited...school calendars must be designed to obtain optimum economic efficiency."

With this statement in mind we may turn to the fact that there is the equivelent of maybe 10-15 billion of unused school physical plant in the United States. The traditional mode of operating this school system underutilizes the PHYSICAL RESOURCES of the system.

However, there is a much more important reason for operating the public school system year round than utilization of physical plant. If the teaching profession is to be competitive, the annual remuneration must be competitive and the only reasonable way to achieve this situation is for the length of the work year to be comparable to the other professions. In order to be fair to the taxpayers it is essential that the teacher's productivity for the extended employment period be as great as during the present regular employment.

We must make a distinction between the issues of (1) extended school year and (2) year-round operation of the schools. It is most important that this distinction be made. It is important that in discussing the subject of "Year-Round Education" we always specify whether the plan under consideration calls for more education to be supplied to students or maintains the present level. Whenever additional education is to be supplied, additional expenditures of funds will be required!!! Some plans require (as part of the plan) "more education" while in other plans it is optional. The amount of money involved can be considerable. For example, to extend the school year to 220 days by supplying additional education to the students would cost in the State of Florida approximately 200 million dollars a year.

We are currently asking for dollars for new capital outlay when the present physical plant is not utilized 25% of the time.

We are underutilizing our educational human resources. Teachers work 9 to 9 1/2 months under a "10 month" contract, YET MUST live, compete, and are expected to survive in the real 12 month world. The resulting personnel problem reduces the quality of the educational system.

SOLUTION - Set up a mode of operation whose format provides for convenient possibility of year round operation and full time employment but does not require it. If the productivity is maintained and if extra education is not provided then there is NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER!!!

An academic year of nine months is a poor choice as an operating unit for a public school system. It is too long a period of time for efficient management of the system. Its recycle time is too long as should a student fail to be promoted. This has been recognized and the school year has often been divided into halves or semesters, particularly at the secondary school level.

A 4 1/2 month term (semester) is still too long a unit of time for use as the operational module of an educational system if flexible scheduling and optimum efficiency are to be obtained. A three month period is a much better choice. Dividing the nine month academic year into thirds to yield three terms of three months each gives us a smaller operating unit which is advantageous. Yet the system is not so administratively complex as to be burdensome.

It is hereby suggested that the school year be divided into three terms each consisting of two 30 day grading periods. Final term grades to be issued at the end of each 60 day interval (i.e. at the end of each even numbered grading period) and mid-term grades be issued at the end of the odd numbered grading periods. Since a 60 day term will be approximately three months, or a quarter of a calendar year, it may be designated a Quarter.

Since each of the 60 day terms is an independent unit with a final grade we can look upon grades 1 through 12 as having been replaced by 36 modules or levels. We now have the basis for a more efficient system. A student's progress is now defined by 36 steps rather than by 12 and promotion is (or can be) by thirds of our new obsolete "academic year". It could thus be possible for a child to repeat less than a full academic year. This offers an opportunity for considerable dollar savings.

By substituting three 60 day units or work for one 180 day unit or for two 90 day units we can:

(1) Relieve student "end of year" pressure.
(2) Provide truer picture of student's academic history by recording more detail.
(3) Better define educational goals and better measure students' progress.
(4) Provide more student motivation and parental interest.
(5) At the secondary school level make it possible to offer a larger variety of courses and make possible a more flexible and complete academic program.
(6) Provide for admission and for recycling of students more often.

The implementation of the fourth module or Summer Term makes possible the full utilization of the resources of the education system. These resources are both physical and human. Year round utilization of physical plant makes it possible to accommodate an increase in student population of up to 33% without any new construction. Year round utilization of physical plant also means a reduction in the cost of any future new construction by up to 25% of the original projected cost.

Implementation of the fourth module also makes possible the full utilization of the human resources of the educational system on a productive basis. It provides a 33% increase in annual income to the teacher who wishes year round employment at no increased cost to the taxpayer. If all teachers should choose to work the full calendar year (and assuming a stable student population) the system would require 25% fewer teachers.

Teachers want more money. Every year hundreds of our best teachers leave the profession. Their loss to the system lowers the quality of the education provided to the students. A 33% higher teacher annual income would make the teaching profession truly competitive and would attract and retain the calibre teacher necessary for a quality education system.

FLORIDA'S STATE GOVERNMENT IN YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION

John W. Seay

Florida, in common with other states, has many problems in education but in this state, the problems all seem to evolve around one factor: Growth. According to the 1970 census, Florida is the second fastest growing state in the nation, with hundreds of new families arriving each week.

These families--most of them at any rate--seem to have children. In the period from 1960 to 1970, our enrollment soared by a half-a-million students, and this is only in our elementary and secondary school. Add additional thousands for community colleges and our universities and you can begin to realize the magnitude of our problem.

We are in the midst of a five-year program to phase in kindergartens so that pre-school offerings will be available to all eligible youngsters in each of our 67 counties by 1973. (In Florida, a county constitutes a school district--67 counties, 67 school systems. No separate city or county systems).

When enrollments go up, you need more of everything in a school system--more teachers, more textbooks, more school buses and more facilities. It is this last one which has given us the greatest concern.

When you have more students than you can crowd into existing classrooms, you know something must be done. There are several alternatives: increase the pupil-teacher ratio, inaugurate double sessions, provide additional facilities--either temporary or permanent, and make better utilization of existing facilities.

There are other alternafives, too, but two factors must always be kept in mind--benefits and costs. Will the student receive better educational opportunities at the same or at reduced costs or will the additional or superior opportunities resulting from the change more than off-set the increased costs?

It is very difficult, as you all realize, to explain to tax-paying parents why a school building cannot be utilized year-round, much like a courthouse or a city hall. Florida took the first, faltering steps to solve this problem shortly after the end of World War Two. The leadership in this effort was provided by the State Department of Education.

After long study by a Citizens' Committee, the 1947 Legislature reorganized the Florida school system, eliminating costly small districts and instituting the countywide districts which we have today.

A part of this revamping also included the enactment of the Minimum Foundation Program--and the Minimum Foundation Program provided the beginnings of a summer enrichment program.

This summer enrichment program--financed at first entirely through state funds--was over and above and in addition to the usual summer remedial academic program--or summer school as parents and students call it. In the years since then, this enrichment program has increased in popularity. Funding of the program has also been expanded and it is now supported through federal, state, district and special grant funds.

In the early days, after the Legislature authorized summer program, Department of Education staff members worked closely with local educators to see how the crowded, regular school year could be relieved. Legislation has been needed to bring about program changes. Statutes have been amended to permit employment of staff beyond the normal 180-day school year. Then there were changes affecting transportation, staff units and others.

The Legislature enacted permissive legislation to allow districts to develop year-round education programs. The intent of this legislation was to encourage innovation. It required only that, "Every such school shall, during the extended term herein authorized, conduct an academic instructional program of the same or greater quality and intensity as that conducted during the require 180 days of instruction."

One of the first districts to get involved in such a program was Broward County. It utilized this legislation to begin a 220-day high school program in 1963 and has expanded this effort to a K-12 program.

Florida's interest has not been limited to K-12 programs only. When the Legislature provided for the community college program in 1957, it was organized on the basis of year-round operation. Each community college is on a modified trimester basis or on a quarter system. The universities operate on the quarter system. The universities operate on the quarter system as required by the Board of Regents.

Florida is more concerned with expanding the extended school year than with simply extending the regular school year. I fully understand and appreciate the need to utilize our physical plants to the utmost, the need to use our highly specialized professional people 12 months a year, the need for maximum use of the equipment and material that has been purchases. We must optimally use our scarce resources.

However, the optimal use of the resources is a means to an end. The end is to assist every student to have the opportunity to develop his capabilities to the fullest extend possible. In accomplishing this I hope that we will have developed the finest citizens possible. That is, young men and women who are capable of establishing careers, homes and contributing to the development of a strong nation. Young men and women whose citizenship will be demonstrated by actively engaging in and upholding the finest traditions of our nation.

In this context we are making an in-depth study of the need for an expanded, extended school year. To date the Department has made an extensive review of the literature on the extended school year and filed a report with the Legislature, conducted an extended school year conference, and approved new experimental extended year programs in three districts. The Legislature authorized the programs and appropriated funds for their operation.

One of the most extensive and long term experimental efforts is in Florida's largest district, Dade County, which encompasses Miami and Miami Beach. The student population growth and the ever-increasing dollar demands for expanded programs led to early county studies seeking solutions to these problems. Dade County came forth with the quinmester type of year-round school calendar. Inaugurating the revolutionary new plan are three schools--Nautilus Junior High and Miami Springs and Miami Beach Senior Highs.

Striving for maximum use of school buildings, many school districts have experimented with various 12-month plans, such as four quarters or trimesters, in place of the traditional two-semester system. However, the quinmester plan, which is uniquely Dade County's, offers not only the long-range hope of increasing plant utilization but brings instant educational benefits in terms of curriculum revision. According to the quinmester planners, while construction dollars may be saved in the future, equally significant is the education impact of what will be happening in the classrooms of Nautilus, Miami Springs, and Miami Beach.

The Quinmester plan divides the school year into five nine-week sessions of 45 school days each. Each pupil may elect to attend any four quinmesters during the school year in order to carry a normal study load for a total of 180 instructional days, which is the present state requirement. Or, a student can accelerate his high school graduation by attending all five quinmesters for a total of 225 instructional days. The quinmester calendar allows for the usual holidays, including Easter and Christman vacations, and teacher planning days when students are not in school.

The summer term, or fifth quinmester, is a departure from present summer programming. The summer term is academically equivalent to the other four terms and is not intended solely for remedial or enrichment work. The quinmester curriculum can be thought of as a series of mini-courses, each nine weeks long and carrying one-quarter credit.

There are three key educational advantages to this plan:

1. It opens the doors for an infinitely richer curriculum. Any number of mini-courses can be developed that are related to one subject--American literature, for example--to [illegible] virtually all tastes and aptitudes. The student has his choice of any four offerings to earn a year's credit.
2. It encourages scholastic experimentation. The student may try a new subject at no great risk. A nine-week module of chemistry is enough to let him decide to pursue the subject or drop it in favor of something else.
3. It has the potential to reduce failure. The student is not locked in on a full-year course; if he fails a nine-week course he loses only one-quarter of a year and his problem can be remedied quickly and perhaps less painfully.

Development of a full quinmester curriculum will require a massive creative effort and a vast expenditure of manpower. Local and state funds already have been earmarked for this purpose. The Dade School Board last May approved a five-year developmental program for the quinmester plan and funded it with $250,000 annually for each of the next three school years. The State Department of Education appropriated $240,000 for the nine-week summer pilot program.

Teachers will be deeply involved in fashioning the future of the quinmester plan. A network of committees will be drawn from instructional staffs and will include representatives from all work and subject areas.

These committees will be engaged in recommendations for curriculum development and administrative prodedures; writing, preparing and screening materials to determine appropriateness and other such activity. Released time will be given for committee work. An effort will be made to utilize teachers who express a special interest in this pacesetting project.

In actual operation, the quinmester plan will offer possible economic advantages for teachers who may want to work the full year. Teachers who work four quinmesters will have a ten-month employment period, excluding holidays. Those who are employed for five quinmesters will be paid for the established period for which they are employed.

An extensive public education effort will be required before the full efficiency of the 12-month school calendar can be realized. The quinmester plan theorically increased capacity of school plants by 25 per cent. A school with a capacity of 2,000 pupils could enroll 2,500 because staggered attendance periods would produce a pupil population of 2,000 during any given quinmester. However, this means that the community would have to accept the idea of 20 per cent of the student body on vacation during each of the five nine-week periods.

Many time-honored patterns of family and community life will be markedly changed if the quinmester plan becomes an operational reality. Recreational and leisure-time programs will be shifted to the 12-month calendar, as will family vacations. When the student begins and ends his school year will vary with his options. There are other problems, too. Would you hold five graduation ceremonies every year? Would students enter first grade every quinmester? How would students participate in extracurricular activities? The quinmester architects recognize that many serious questions will have to be answered.

But for the immediate future, it is certain that the implications of the experiments at Dade County's first three quinmester shcools will spread throughout the system.

The pilot quinmester program that was offered at Miami Springs Senior High, during the summer of 1970, enrolled an unexpected total of 1,540 students from all parts of the county. A special inducement was that students could earn two credits in the longer sessions, versus one credit in other summer school programs.

The other two experimental programs are located in smaller districts. One of the programs is in a K-5 elementary school and the other is in a K-12 school center.

The elementary school project extends the regular nine-month program to an 11-month program. It is developed around a continuous progress curriculum involving team planning and teaching. The present program has been in operation since the school opened in 1967. The K-12 school center experimental program extends the regular school year by 30 days. It is intended to extend the present summer program and the regular school year program.

These three experimental programs will be evaluated. With the evaluation information and additional information about our present summer school program available we will be able to analyze the data to see it it will provide answers to a number of questions.

I would like to list some of the kinds of questions for which we are seeking answers:

1. How many extra rooms were utilized as a result of the extended year? How much money was saved?
2. How many additional students participated?
3. What revisions were made in curriculum? How did these changes influence students' performance?
4. How did the extended year assist or hinder accreditation?
5. How many students needed help to improve their performance? How many did the year assist?
6. How many students received enrichment as a result of the year? What new enrichment programs resulted?
7. How many students failed last year? How does this compare after one year of the extended year?
8. How many additional subjects were offered? How many students took advantage of these?

We plan to expand our extended year on the basis of past experience and the results of our experimental programs. Decisions for implementation and operation of new programs will depend on student, parent and community needs. When these needs have been determined and specific objectives developed to meet them then we will be in a position to design programs to meet these needs. It will then be up to the citizens through their elected representatives to determine the "how much" and "when" for the fiscal requirements.

POLITICS AND YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION

Dr. Wendell H. Pierce

I would like to explore some of the political implications and realistic strategies which all of us educators must consider if the benefits of year-round operation are to be universally achieved in our school systems.

As you may know, the Education Commission of the States is a nationwide organization to bring together the political and educational leadership of the states into a working partnership for the benefit of education. Through our work with governors and legislators it becomes increasingly obvious that the implementation of educational innovation lies as much in the hands of those of us who have followed a career in educational administration. The necessity for operating funds is a fact which just cannot escape the attention of any superintendent. Naturally, it becomes essential to understand some of the attitudes of our political policy makers and then to explore ways that we can help them to understand new directions for education which require political support and funding. . . .

We have found a very substantial interest in the concept of the year-round school among governors and legislators. Much of the interest is unfortunately based on misinformation or curiosity. There are many myths about year-round operation which ECS is attempting to dispell and clarify. So it becomes our responsibility to develop an intelligent interpretation of various programs related to an extended school year. Let us think for a few minutes about how you would response to some of the typical questions which political leaders ask about the year-round educational system.

The first question we might hear is whether a 12 month school year is one of the answers to the growing demand in our country for a higher level of accountability in education? There are certainly many facets to the accountability theme, but none is more striking than the one which questions whether the taxpayers are getting their full value worth from the tremendous expenditures for school systems. The idea of greater utilization of a sometimes idle school plant and the opportunity for students to be in school for longer periods of the year often becomes particularly appealing to those who echo the clarion call of "accountability". So for some political leaders, the concept of the 12 month school year becomes an obvious pathway to receive more for the educational dollar. Some legislators have clearly expressed the view that the financial crises facing many states will make a move to an extended school year absolutely mandatory merely to seek economies and improved efficiencies. Without going into the truth or error of this viewpoint, I think it is important to realize that many political leaders tend to look at the 12 month year solely as an answer to the rising tide of school expenditures. We must be prepared to respond to this position.

A second question which political policy makers are asking is whether a longer school year would actually improve the quality of education in our states? We can answer this question in many ways. The concept which is the most important to clarify to policy makers is that most proposals for an extended school year offer a variety of new educational opportunities and are not merely a continuation of the traditional nine-month school program. An extended school year offers an unusual opportunity to enrich the curriculum and teaching of any school system. We must respond to policy makers that these programs offer the schools the chance to initiate new and exciting avenues of learning, to offer students instructional experiences not now available, and to build a total school experience which is geared to living in the 1970's and 80's. Extending the school year does not guarantee that we can improve the quality of education--but it gives a challenge to every educator to design a program and curriculum which we may never before thought possible. The educational value of the extended school will depend entirely upon the creative talent of those who design the curriculum and instructional approaches to be used in the new time blocks.

The third question which legislators and governors have raised is whether we really can change the traditional patterns of family life to use the summer time for school rather than a three-month vacation? Undoubtedly, the foremost argument we hear against a longer school calendar is that parents and teachers will be reluctant to consider major changes in their present vacation practices and habits. Certainly resistance to change is a human tendancy, but I believe that if we can develop some convincing reasons to show we can meet some of the changing needs of society we can be equally effective in overcoming this resistance to change. When policy makers stop to consider that the current nine-month school year evolved from the needs of a rural society it is reasonable to assume that they will respond to valid arguments which support a school calendar which is designed to fit the needs of today's rapidly growing urban and suburban communities. In a society which seems to give youngsters more and more leisure time and does not offer nearly as many opportunities for young people to work at home or in the community as we knew a few generations ago, it is difficult to justify our current educational practice which literally dumps some 50 million school children on the community during a long hot summer of idleness and boredom. Furthermore, some of the proposals for a year-round school may become very beneficial to the life style of millions of Americans who flock to the highways and vacation spots in summer months. As the population continues to expand, the nation may need a new school pattern to encourage even more staggered vacation periods for families who still seek to enjoy parks, lakes and recreation lands. Political leaders and population ecologists might find that their support of an all-year school would offer significant values to a richer life for all, far exceeding the educational goals involved.

These questions may give you a brief idea of the concerns which political leaders have about the program and the kinds of responses we have been giving. There are many other questions which policy makers ask about the extended school year.

For example, the legal and financial issues are complex for most states. Some political leaders are already disenchanted with much of the educational processes, curriculum and structure, and are not enthusiastic about any program which appears to be an expansion of the same kinds of dreary educational systems we have developed. Obviously the broader picture of a 12 month school has not been fully explained.

From my vantage point in working closely with the nations leaders in state government and state educational agencies, I see great interest developing in an extended school year, but there is a mighty wide gap between this growing interest and effective or universal implementation. For a few moments lets look at what our task may be to seek greater understanding and support for year-round school operations. First, lets look at our real goals and objectives, and secondly, what strategy could be suggested for implementation.

What are the goals and objectives of an extended school year? Certainly when you have 50 or 60 different scheduling patterns to look at, the fundamental purposes of each may vary greatly. But to sell a substantial new concept the political leaders of our states we will have to come to grips with the difficult and complex task of clearly identifying the three, five or ten goals of 12 month operation. The first step in improving education is choosing and clearly stating appropriate goals--all else follows. I suspect that much of the dissatisfaction with public education may not be so much the result of poor educational processes as of the confusion over the goals of education. The goals of an extended school year must primarily be concerned with the improvement of learning opportunities and procedures for the benefit of students. Furthermore, when we consider educational goals, the major targets must be acceptable to the majority of the persons concerned with them: the students, their parents, the public that finances education, and the educators who are charged with seeing that the goals we will have a guide for future decision making and action.

As I read reports after reports on the 12 month school year, or any of the other forms of an extended calendar, I am constantly amazed at the apparent lack of clear-cut goals and objectives. Most programs have a series of conflicting or confusing set of goals. We often hint that the program may save money, or accelerate student progress, or enrich the educational program, or do a dozen other things which somebody may think beneficial. If I didn't know better, I would draw the conclusion that a few of the proponents of the extended year diliberately "hedge" on stating goals because they either weren't sure what the program would accomplish, or that they wanted to be sufficiently vague in order to include a plum for everyone.

For example, if it is reasonably obvious that the expanded school year system you proposed is not going to reduce school expenditures, it achieves nothing to hold out to parents and legislators the potential expectation that the extended calendar will provide savings to the taxpayers. I like John Letson's approach when he initiated a year-round system in Atlanta. The goal was not to relieve overcrowded schools or reduce capital expenditures or to accelerate students, even though these might have been considered by-products. Atlanta clearly analyzed their school system and came to the conclusion that their curriculum was not doing the job for which it was organized. The year-round system was created as a way to redesign the curriculum and give the students greater flexibility in scheduling, enlarge the educational opportunities provided by the school system, and to eliminate some of the frustrating lockstep of the high school program. The year-round system is just a part of the completely re-written high school curriculum to provide optimum flexibility for pupils. The goal of the Atlanta system seemed clear and well stated, and gained the support of the community.

As you proceed to establish your goals and objectives, I urge you to be absolutely candid in your evaluation. Here are some questions you might start asking and let the answers fall where they may:

Will your new school calendar actually save money, save space, reduce capital expenditure, relieve over-crowded conditions or eliminate double sessions?

Will the program accelerate student's progress--resulting in earlier graduation, entry into college, or entry into the labor market? And if so, is there really a need to accomplish this?

Will the program be designed to keep young people off the streets during the summer months and thus reduce delinquency, vandalism and boredom? And if so, is this really the responsibility of the school system and worth the time and effort?

Will the program be designed to give year-round employment for teachers who would otherwise be unemployed during the summer months, and who might be tempted to seek professions in other fields where they could receive greater financial returns for a full year's work?

Are we seeking a change in the traditional school calendar merely for the sake of change or merely because it appears to the public that school buildings are standing idle for three months out of the year?

Will the program add enrichment ot the educational experience of youngsters, thereby giving them more choices in a challenging school curriculum and give them better preparation for the world in which they will live?

Will the program really be designed to assist the slow and marginal learner which in turn would reduce the stigma and incidence of failure in the school experience?

To those of you who are committed to the belief that a year-round program is sound and inevitable, these questions may seem superfluous or too elementary for serious consideration. But I submit that these and similar questions must be positively and clearly answered in order to establish the goals and objectives which will enable year-round operation to be fully endorsed by the public and the elected policy-makers.

Finally, lets turn our attention for a few moments to the other practical consideration of implementing a program of year-round operation. You might assume that once goals and objectives are clearly stated and adopted and the program seems to be a viable innovation to the school system, that implementation would be an easy task. But educational innovation, regardless of its merit, is a difficult assignment and almost certain to generate controversy. Developing a detailed strategy for implementing any year-round plan is as essential as creating the basic plan itself. Implementation required several things, such as:

1. Widespread involvement in the process of developing the original plans and full communication if public and staff misunderstandings and resistance are to be avoided or minimized; this often requires a citizen advisory group which can take an active part in developing acceptable plans.

2. A basic commitment of human and economic resources is necessary if innovation is to be accomplished; and,

3. Extensive reorientation or retraining of teachers and other staff members will probably be needed, especially as you proceed to restructure curriculum and establish pilot programs.

Once an acceptable and workable local plan is agreed upon, what kind of strategy should you consider for implementation? The first step is the one I mentioned before--clarify your goals and objectives. Goals are essential not only to explain the proposed project, but as a basis for evaluating and measuring results and in making realistic reports to the public. The goals must be described in language which is understandable to the most casually interested policy-maker or the most critical parent. Education-eze will not do. If your plans cannot be stated in clear-cut single syllable language, then I suspect that your goals are not fully developed and internally understood. Generally this takes skill--but effective communication is absolutely essential at this step.

The second step towards implementation of your new ideas of year-round operation would also have to have begun at an earlier stage in the development of the plan.

This is public involvement at the outset. Public acceptance of new ideas are generally contingent upon public involvement in their design. There is a very important role for parents, civic groups, other planning agencies, students, concerned lay persons, consultants with special skills, and members of policy boards, as well as educators in planning for an innovation to the school calendar. If we are serious about designing a program which must be implemented through community support and finance, lets not forget the addage: "education is too important to be left solely to the educators." You'll find that citizen committees have a valuable role not only in developing the program, but even more important in gaining public support for implementation.

A third step necessary for implementing a year-round operation is to anticipate the practical applications of the plan in order that political leaders can effectively endorse them. There [illegible] be a core of legislators who understand your program and will carry the banner for it in the legislative halls. By practical applications, I mean that the legislator must be given valid, concrete information about the absolute economic feasibility of the year-round operation as well as the educational value of the proposal. We must arm our legislators with proven facts and sound opinion if we expect them to do battle on our behalf in the legislative appropriation wars. By-in-large the quality of legislators in most states, and especially those on education committees, is extremely high. They are intelligent men and women. They will give us the support we need if we can effectively do our part in providing straight-forward information about the merits and limitations of year-round operations. This often requires a selling job--but if we have a good product, it can be sold effectively.

Along the same line of implementation which you might consider insignificant, but shouldn't be overlooked, is the label of the plan we ask legislators to approve. A "12 month school year" might not be as attractive as something called "a flexible school calendar". One survey indicated that the public opposed a plan called the "Staggered Quarter Extended Year Plan" but at the same time was sympathetic to the "Continuous Learning Year Cycling Plan." I'm not sure I'd support a plan with that name, myself. In other words, it is difficult to get support for a program which isn't very salable or understandable.

A fourth step of implementation may be the most difficult--seeking support of the faculty and staff for year-round operations. This is especially true if we propose one of the systems which would materially change the customary curriculum, courses of study, length of terms, teaching schedule, mandatory participation and similar structure of the school system. Success of most year-round operations is dependent upon the acceptable and understanding of the teaching and administrative staff of the school system. Active involvement of school personnel at all levels is essential to developing the cooperation necessary for success. The disruptive processes of change must be fully recognized and accounted for in your steps of implementation. Teacher employment practices, and similar considerations must be thoroughly recognized at the outset and given primary attention if the full support of teachers and teacher associations is to be received.

These steps are some of the most obvious to me in seeking political support to implement any of the many plans of year-round operation.

In conclusion, let me say that the work you are doing at this Third National Seminar is extremely important to American education. To make any substantive change in education is a gigantic task. Educators are slow to give way to traditional patterns. There is nothing like a school system--so quick to change other's affairs, but so slow to change its own. So don't be discouraged if you find the occasional opposition from those who are solely content to perpetuate the past, or those whose vested interests seem threatened by change, or those who see little merit in curriculum enrichment. The future of education is not really in their hands. The future can only be in those who are willing to be creative, to innovate, and to be willing to try new ideas not just because they are new, but because they seem better. Sure there will be some failures. Many great ideas don't always work out the first time. This should not discourage any educator worth his salt.

Certainly the year-round school idea is not the panacea for all the ills of education in America. But we cannot discount the fact that these ideas seem to be causing many administrators and educators to begin to think about new ways to cope with the vastly exploding knowledge and how curriculum can be designed to meet the needs of a new generation of students. The dynamic society of the 70's and 80's may no longer permit "education as usual", and the extended school year, in one of its many forms, may well place the nine month school year, in the same category as the Pullman car, a silver dollar and a good five cent cigar, as another luxury which America is no longer able to afford.

112

FULTON COUNTY YEAR-ROUND PLAN

Dr. Paul D. West

From the very beginning the main thrust of this program has been toward a more qualitiative education, especially for those students who attend what used to be called "summer school". Several years ago we were arrested by the realization that one-fourth of our high school population was voluntarily attending summer school and paying tuition for it.

Unfortunately, we were not offering work in the summer that was equivalent either quantitatively or qualitatively with that offered during the other portions of the school year.

It was reasonable, therefore, to conclude that these students attending during the summer deserved a quality of work fully comparable to that offered at other times. It is interesting to note that seventy per cent of the work taken by these students was "new work"--work they had never had before. The image of summer school has changed from a period in which flunk-outs make up failures to a period in which students for the most part are taking advanced work. All the more reason, therefore, for qualitative program for such students. They deserve it.

Again, the main purpose we have in this program is one of qualitative education--our purpose has not been basically to save money, to graduate students earlier or to use buildings over an entire year. These, in our view, are ancillary outcomes but do not represent the basic thrust.

We caution that this is not a program to enter overnight. It taked time and the effort of many people to develop a program with any chance whatever of success. We spent at least three years in the planning of this program.

Eight school systems in Metropolitan Atlanta were involved in the planning of the program and six or seven of the eight are currently implementing it.

In simple terms it is the calendar of colleges and universities that are on the quarter system. We have discarded the two eighteen-week semester year plus an abbreviated summer session of eight weeks to a four term year of twelve weeks for each of the first three terms and 10 weeks for the fourth term. Each of the subjects in the fourth term, however, has the same integrity of time as the same subject offered in one of the first three terms. We accomplished this by running the subject class periods for the fourth term ten minutes longer than the periods for the other terms.

The reason we make a difference between the fourth and the other terms in this respect is in order to maintain the integrity of our holiday structure--Christmas, Thanksgiving, Easter, etc.

We have abolished the Carnegie Unit System of one unit per thirty-six weeks of work. Faced with the decision of what credit to give for a 12-week term, we decided rather than to go to a fractional value like one-third unit per subject it would be better to go to a quarter or credit hour system. We, therefore, give five credit hours per subject per term. We give five credit hours for each subject taken, including those at the eighth grade, and require a total of 375 credit hours for graduation. This is the equivalent of 25 units including the eighth grade inasmuch as fifteen credit hours represent the value of one "old" Carnegie Unit.

Here is the heart and core of our plan. The entire secondary school curriculum has been reorganized and restructured in order to provide flexibility both for the student's program and for the school schedule, and also to eliminate the rigid lockstep of required sequence in the taking of courses.

For some time we had suspected that much of the ironclad sequence in the taking of secondary course work could be abolished but we were astonished as well as highly gratified after a three-year study that 70 per cent of high school subject area work could be so reorganized that courses need not be sequential.

There are some exceptions, of course, such as beginning French and elementary algebra. But all English is non-sequential, all social science, all home economics, pratically all health and physical education, business education, industrial arts, about one-half the science courses, and many of the math courses above the very beginning level.

Problems are as follows:

1. The main problem is that the program, while state endorsed, has not yet been state financed. The State Superintendent of Schools has placed $4,000,000 in the state budget which will be presented to the incoming legislature. This amount should finance the program for the systems interested in it.
2. A corrollary of this problem is that students have to pay tuition to attend the fourth or summer term. Our charges are $20 for the first subject and $18 for each succeeding subject. A full load of work would, therefore, cost $92--a deterrent to many students.
3. It is not possible without state finance to pay teachers their full scale pay for the ten weeks.

   Without state finance fourth term operations must be confined only to those centers with an enrollment sufficient to schedule a comprechevsive program of work.
5. Without state finance it is not possible to attract a sufficient number of students to take a full program of work for the four term operation to achieve its full potential. One of the elements of this potential is for the student to be able, if

he wishes, to substitute the fourth term for any one of the other three terms. obviously, before a school district can permit a student to miss the first, second or third term, anticipating the substitution of the fourth term for it, the district must be certain it will have available in the fourth term what the student missed in the term he was out of school.

Advantages of the program are:

1. Each subject in the fourth term has the same integrity of quality that such subject has in any one of the other three terms.
2. Students by attending all four terms may be graduated earlier, or may get a much broader, deeper secondary school preparation. Indeed, many of our students take work in the fourth term which they do not have time to get during the first three terms.
3. Subject matter is capsuled into more compact and viable elements in 12 week periods. than it can be in eighteen or thirty-six week periods.
4. The variety and flexibility of in depth, concentrated courses, to which reference has already been made. The departure from conventionally required sequence in courses. Each course stands on its own and is evaluated in its own right.
5. The provision for moving a student at an earlier time (12 weeks) out of a course in which he is not proving successful.
6. A reduction in the percentage of failures. In the Fulton County System the percentage of failures in the first year of the program dropped by about forty per cent. In terms of budget dollars, this fact alone saved the school district over $400,000.
7. One of the greatest advantages we are just now on the point of realizing--the provision that a student may attend any three of the four terms, and be out of school any one of the four terms he wishes. Business and industry are very much interested in this development. So is the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce.

We are committed to this program and convinced it is workable. Some of its potential cannot be immediately realized, but two years' experience with it documents our belief that it is in the best interest of student, school, and community in making available a secondary school program of quality the year round and at any time in the year.

JEFFERSON COUNTY PLAN

Richard VanHoose

In November of 1968, the Jefferson County School System launched an extended school year feasibility study. With the help of advisory committees the staff researched the available literature and reviewed the findings of communities that have experimented with the extended school year. All of this was done in an attempt to isolate one extended school year plan that had potential for the school community.

After eighteen months of study it was apparent to us that the evidence indicated that better utilization of resourses could be achieved by turning away from the September-to-June calendar.

On May 25, 1970, my board adopted a voluntary four-quarter plan, one that we have chosen to call Elective Quarter Plan, as a school calendar plan having tremendous potential for the school system. The Elective Quarter Plan divides the school year into four equal quarters, each consisting of approximately sixty days.

Without question the strongest argument in favor of this plan is its potential to benefit children. The plan will allow many alternatives in curriculum selection, school attendance patterns, etc. Subjects now offered on a semester or a full year basis must be redesigned for completion in sixty days. The courses shall be designed to "stand alone" and shall, as much as possible, be offered non–sequentially.

By offering courses that will stand alone in twelve-week time spans the year around, tremendous flexibility in scheduling is allowed. The number of courses developed in each subject area will depend upon the need of the discipline. But in most disciplines students will have greater choices of subject than before. Instead of English I, required of all students, there may well be one prerequisite quarter course, with the students having a choice of six or seven other courses without regard to sequence. The same would hold true for mathematics, science, and the like--one or two prerequisite courses and the rest left to the choice of the students. In all likelihood these courses will be graduated by degree of difficulty, allowing choice to the fast college-bound student, the average student, and the slow student.

Curriculum begins where the children are. Curriculum development requires the making of choices, so the planning of a relevant curriculum must include criteria for making these choices Our plan of curriculum development calls for the involvement of students, teachers, and parents.

Reorganization for an Elective Quarter Plan has enabled us to take a new look at what we have been doing. To ask: Why is this content more important than that? To whom? We have a task force of highly qualified individuals trying to incorporate meaningful activities in each of the disciplines. These activities should cause students to be better equipped to live in a world undergoing rapid social change.

Research has enabled us to identify levels of thinking. Memory or recall does not demand a high level of thinking. In the past we have often asked for nothing more--give the facts; get them back. There is a sequence in levels of thinking; there may not be a sequence in what we think about. John Michaelis, an eminent social scientist, has said that we can have facts without thinking but we cannot think without facts.

Emphasis is on the child, his concept of himself in his world, his feelings and his sensitivity to the feelings of others; an understanding of his own values, and the recognition of the values of others.

The expanse of knowledge today is such that it is impossible to teach all there is to know about anything; so we develop criteria for selecting content samples. Greater success for the student's development of thinking skills--his ability to generalize and apply his knowledge is possible when the content is representative and relevant--valid, significant, appropriate, durable, and balanced. The Elective Quarter Plan makes such relevance and balance possible.

The goal is no longer to cover any given text, but to choose material from many texts and from other media that enable the student to meet specific educational objectives. Choices then are for content samples, teaching strategies, and materials. Choices that must be made in terms of student needs.

Specific objectives are identified in terms of expectation--student performance. With such objectives defined evaluation or accountability is built into the curriculum.

These are the tasks we accept in curriculum revision:

A student-centered curriculum inevitably embraces an inquiry or discovery approach. Support for the teacher then must include processes for the implementation of the new ideas as well as the ideas themselves--not only WHAT but HOW.

This is theory. Valid curriculum grows from a cycle of theory and practice. Since time has been allowed for planning prior to the implementation of the Elective Quarter Plan, the process of theory to practice is becoming a reality. Choices are being made--choices of the objectives, content, materials, and strategies for development in a 60-day block. These initial outlines are being sent to many other teachers for study and trial. The feedback and evaluation of the experimental units and outlines will provide the bases for valid future decisions.

SECONDARY
STUDENT
REACTION

Fulton County

Cathy Clemmer

The first two years of my secondary education were spent in Fulton County under the semester plan. The last three years have been on the quarter system and have been in the process of reworking courses and scheduling to implement the year-round education plan.

Under the semester system, an excellent education was available to the student who fit into one of several molds provided. Academic (or college prep), business, and general courses were offered, with some room for differences within each. However, the choice of specific courses within subject areas was not generally made by the student or his parents, or to some extent, even the teachers. A year of a subject was planned by educators in the county and, with some variations by individual teachers, had the same material presented to him.

The semester system is wonderful for the "average" student, since each year is set up to provide the "average" student with the opportunity to learn what he needs. The difficulty comes when you deal with the "exceptional" student, which really includes all students. All students are either above or below average in interest and ability in at least one field. Therefore, each student needs a curriculum which is flexible enough to fit him, instead of the student being forced to be the flexible element. The curriculum must allow for differences between students and for changes in interest and development that occur in students as they mature.

The semester system did not offer this flexibility. Changes in courses were often provided too late to be most effective. Failures at mid-term often result in long waits and wasted time before the student can repeat. Also, shifting of students from lower to more advanced levels at mid-year is not feasible.

The quarter system provides the students with more choices more often about curriculum. Students can adjust the courses to meet their needs. The system serves the students rather than the students serving the system.

PRINCIPAL, TEACHER REACTION

Fulton County
Jefferson County

Max McBrayer (principal)

The four-quarter plan of the year-round school concept is liked by the administrator, faculty, student body, and community. The degree of freedom it provides for source selection, the responsibility of scheduling himself, and the greater variety of courses appeal to the students.

Although there are many facets of the program that can be discussed, the outstanding advantage has been the study revision, and reorganization of the total curriculum. The existing structure also represents a break from the traditional and provides an excellent base from which continued improvements can be made.

These comments are not intended to indicate that the quarter plan is the only, or even best, answer, but rather to express the opinion that it constitutes a real improvement over the program provided in Fulton County in years past. Even though there may be some problems in the implementation of the four-quarter plan, it does indicate a sincere, man-size effort by the administrators and teachers to improve the educational program so as to benefit the young people of Fulton County, Georgia.

J. C. Cantrell (principal)

The primary objectives at present of our year-round program, the Elective Quarter Plan, are as follows: (1) to improve educational opportunities for boys and girls, this would be done by a more flexible and more comprehensive program of study; (2) to provide year-round employment for teachers instead of relegating them to unemployment or forcing them to give up their chosen profession for three months each year and seek employment elsewhere; (3) to open the school buildings year-round as needed in answer to the often heard criticism--"How can we afford to spend so much on school plants then close them down for three months each year?" (4) to reduce the total number of buildings required; (5) to give both pupils and teachers more choices--more elections. Secondary objectives, residual expectations or fringe benefits, if you please; from the Elective Quarter Plan or any quarter plan could very well be the following: (1) to save money, (2) to save space or relieve over-crowded conditions--to make greater use of present facilities, (3) to end double sessions, (4) to add enrichment--widen scope of subjects taken, (5) to prevent loss of learning during the long summer vacations, (6) to accelerate--resulting in early graduation, if there is a need, (7) could provide for early entry into college, if there is a need, (8) to reduce failures, (9) to reduce, or delay, dropouts, (10) to allow the disadvantaged to stay on schedule--graduate with their class, and (11) could provide for early entry into labor market, if there is a need.

Today there are those demanding change for the sake of change. There are those who have doubts and resefvations as to the 180-day school year largely because buildings are idle some three months of the year. It is hoped and I strongly feel that the recent decision of our Board of Education was one that will not only open the school buildings year-round but more important will provide courses, as the boys and girls say, "relevant to their needs, current and challenging," to the end that new confidence and a fresh and wholesome sense of direction toward education, toward life and toward the future will develop.

Frances Padgett (teacher)

The four quarter plan as it is implemented in Fulton County has been successful because it has provided an opportunity for curriculum change. Because of its flexibility, students have nore options in planning their schedules.

Since courses are offerec several times a year, materials can be utilized to better advantage. The difficulty of obtaining materials for a twelve-week time block causes teachers to create their own learning units.

This creativity requirement for the teacher can be both a strength and weakness of the program. Unless the teacher is given time for such creativity, the program will not improve; the curriculum will remain basically the same as ynder the nine-month school year.

Reece Little (teacher)

Many distinguished people are turning their attention to the phenomenon of change. Some say that change is the only certainty in a sea of relativity. Educators, usually the last and the slowest to react to change, must address their full strength to the problem of helping students acquire first, the necessary knowledge and skills required for understanding change and, second, the skills required for making decisions forces upon people by change.

As a teacher, I see the continuing four-quarter plan of education as a vehicle for facilitating the development of several desirable factors necessary for equipping students, for meeting the challenges presented by change. Students will be offered roughly three times as many opportunities for selecting classes as they generally now have. Inherent in this increased opportunity for class selection is the need for developing more autonomous students.

Curriculum changes will be necessary for implementation of the continuing four-quarter plan. Obviously, shorter courses will better hold the attention of students than do long courses. With improved attention and interest should come better class attendance. At the same time, shorter courses would allow teachers to become more specialized and skilled in strategies and to become more familiar with the resources for a very particular content area.

Assuming that curriculum writers take only slight advantage of the opportunity handed them by the process of implementing a four-quarter plan, teachers could be provided with the newest available strategies and resources via new curriculum materials. Consequently, but apparently unnoticed or overlooked by many short-sighted administrators, the most important effect which will likely result from implementation of a year-round program is curriculum change at the grass roots level--curriculum change which will likely affect not only materials used, but also the philosopies and strategies of teaching held by teachers.

Finally, I believe the continuing four-quarter plan holds great promise for improving the educational experiences of youngsters. If implemented by a school system, the plan should greatly facilitate the efforts of teachers directed toward providing an interesting and rewarding learning situation for their students.

HAYWARD UNIFIED PLAN

Raymond Arveson

Hayward is a community of nearly 150,000 population in the East Bay of the San Francisco Bay Area. It is a suburban middle socio economic community that is essentially a "bedroom community". Most of the people who live in Hayward work in industries and service occupations outside the Hayward area. Hayward Unified School District has 48 schools with an enrollment of nearly 30,000 students. Park Elementary School is a very average elementary school in the Hayward Unified School District. It has a population of between 425 and 452 students and is located in the center of the Hayward School District.

The idea for an all year round or four quarter elementary school originated with two elementary school principals, Barney Maura and Dan Foster. They presented the idea to the district for consideration. The district decided it was worthy of study and sought funds to conduct a feasibility study. During the summer of 1967, the district received an ESEA Title III grant of $31,403 for the purpose of conducting a feasibility study during the period from September 1, 1967 through January 31, 1969. The district later received a continuation grant of $29, 538 to cover the period of February 1, 1969 to August 31, 1969. The feasibility study consisted of independent staff planning, curriculum development and in-service education. A number of consultants were used during this time including Dr. Marilyn Hunter, Director of the University Elementary School at UCLA.

The purpose for developing an all year round school program that all students would attend all year round were developed and carefully considered and included:

1. A longer instructional year to provide more time for children's learning.
2. A longer school year would provide additional time to include more curricular offerings for elementary students.
3. Shorter vacation periods at more frequent intervals would reduce the loss of learning that occurs during the traditionally long summer vacation.
4. The more frequent vacations would tend to alleviate both student and teacher fatigue.
5. The greater amount of time would provide opportunity for flexibility including the opportunity for more in depth instruction.
6. The time between quarters would provide teachers with an opportunity to plan together for curricular development and instructional procedures.
7. The time between quarters provides the opportunity for the teachers to have meaningful parent teacher conferences and thus provide closer communication between the home and the school.

8. The quarter system was correlated with the quarter system of the State College to provide the opportunity for teachers to take leaves for advance study.

9. The more frequent shorter vacation provides opportunities for a variety of vacation schedules and plans.

10. Provides all year round use of school facilities.

11. Better utilization of audio visual and other instructional materials and resources.

12. Provides additional time for both remedial and enrichment instruction.

Because the school year for Park School would differ from the school year of the other elementary schools in the district, it was necessary to seek legislative approval for the experimental all year round school. Assemblyman Carlos Bee, of the 13th District in Hayward, introduced Assembly Bill 1971, that was passed by the California State Legislature and signed into law by the Governor on August 6, 1968. AB 1971 provided legislative entitlement for the experiment to continue for a two year period. In 1970, Assemblyman Bee introduced AB 1691 to allow for an additional five years of operation. This bill received unanimous approval of the legislature and was signed into law permitting the all year round program to continue through the 1974-75 school year.

The school year consists of four quarters of approximately 50 days each, with three weeks between quarters. One week of each break is devoted to parent conferences, teacher inservice education and teacher planning. Teachers then have two weeks vacation between quarters. The district's Christmas and Spring vacations coincide with the three week quarter breaks.

When the feasibility study began and prior to the implementation of the program, teachers were given the option of remaining at Park School or transferring to another elementary school in the district. Assignment at Park School is always on a voluntary basis since teachers and other staff members work on an all year round basis.

Title III funds provided money for inservice education for curricular development and for some special instructional materials. The Title III funds also funded an independent evaluation that was conducted by General Behavioral Systems, Incorporated.

The legislative entitlement provided that additional state apportionment funds could accrue to the district for the additional days that school was in session. This provides the major share of the additional funding that is needed for teaching, administrative and staff salaries that are prorated for the additional number of work days.

123

The initial evaluation of the program was generally positive, but it was definitely the thinking of the staff that the program should be continued on an experimental basis for an additional length of time to provide a more valid basis for decision about the future of the program. Reports were made on the program to the State Board of Education and to the Legislature. The new legislation provides for additional reports to the State Department of Education, the State Board of Education and the Legislature. On the basis of future evaluation and these reports, decisions will be made for continuing and or extending the program to other schools, both within and outside the district.

VALLEY VIEW
45-15
PLAN

Kenneth Hermansen

You have heard and read much about the Valley View 45-15 Continuous School Year Plan. This scheduling system raises many questions and issues for the children and the parents and teachers and administrators.

Valley View School District #96, Will County, Illinois, is west of Lockport. The school district varies from three to six miles in width, and is about nine and a half miles in length.

Approximately 80 per cent of the land area of the school district is rural area, many houses have been built in small groups or as individual homesites. Indications are that the trend to more home construction in the rural area will continue.

Nineteen Hundred Sixty-Eight - enrollment 4,942 students, school board directed administration to "design a sound educational program for the extended use of school facilities and personnel in District #96".

By 1980 we will have 22,000 pupils in grades K-8.

A little of the chronological history of the Valley View District gives insights into our problems:

> 1953 - The district had five one-room country schools with a total enrollment of eighty-nine students in grades one through eight, there were approximately 200 homes in the entire district;
> 1960 - Enrollment 884 students, ten time the enrollment 7 years ago;
> 1962 - Park View School, twenty-four classroom building was constructed and occupied;
> 1963 - Enrollment went up 174% in three years. The district had over 3,000 homes.

The 45-15 Plan was developed out of necessity. It is not claimed that the 45-15 Plan will solve all the problems of District #96 or that it will solve the problems of lack of classrooms for many years.

Many other school districts both in Illinois and in other states have shown great interest in the 45-15 Plan. The 45-15 Plan may be helpful to other school districts or it may not. Administrators from District #96 will *tell* others about how the 45-15 Plan works but do not intend to *sell* the 45-15 Plan as a cure-all for the problems of all other school districts.

The 45-15 Plan was designed to maintain the quality of education in District #96. It was not designed as an experimental program, as a device for improving the teachers' schedule, as an administrative convenience, as a way to graduate the children from eighth grade sooner, or as a plan to (primarily) save money.

The Valley View 45-15 Plan is a method of assignment of pupils, building facilities, and staff members. By better use of the buildings and equipment, by more use of the personnel, and by a more equal distribution of pupil attendance throughout the year, the school district has a savings in building construction costs, a longer working year for some certified and non-certified employees (with corresponding increases in income), and quality education for the student body.

The plan is educationally sound, financially desirable, and legally possible.

1) With a standard annual calendar, Saturdays and Sundays, all Illinois legal school closings, a week at Christmas, a week at Easter, and a period of five to nine class days in July (as an adjusting period) have been designated as school closing times

2) All District #96 pupils have been placed in one of four groups (A, B, C, or D). All children in the same family were placed on the same attendance schedule, even though the children may be at different grade levels or at different buildings. The four groups will always stay in the same order of rotation.

3) June 30, 1970 was set as the starting date for pupils in Group A. All pupils in this group attend classes for 45 *class days* and then have a 15 *class day* vacation period. Four such cycles per calendar year gives the pupil 180 class days per school and calendar year.

4) Group B pupils begin 15 class days fater Group A; Group C pupils begin 15 class days after Group B; Group D pupils begin 15 class days after Group C; etc. In this way, each group will attend 45 class days and then have 15 class days as a vacation. At any one time, however, only three of the four groups will be attending class. Or stated differently, because of the staggered starting date one of the groups will be on vacation while three of the groups will be in school.

ADMINISTRATOR, STUDENT REACTION

Hayward
Valley View

Robert Williams (administrator)

Will a school with an extended school year and three-week vacation periods provide a program for children that will minimize the loss of learning that occurs over the traditional long summer vacation? In an attempt to answer this question and investigate other significant aspects of elementary school curriculum and organization, Hayward Unified School District developed a plan for a compulsory year-round elementary school. Through the cooperative efforts of central staff, teachers and a principal, the plan was developed to be implemented in one elementary school and an application for Title III, ESEA funds was submitted and approved.

The first phase of the feasibility study was to asses the attitudes of the parents of the school community. An extensive investigation involving open meetings, written surveys, a newspaper survey, and a final written questionnaire-survey showed 80 per cent acceptance of the compulsory program. The California State Legislature granted permission, provided additional funding for the extra days in session, and specified that a report be made to the Legislature at the completion of each full year of operation. The first quarter began in September, 1968.

The classes of the school were organized on a nongraded basis with two and three-year age spans. The pupils were placed in classes which would best meet the needs of each individual while at the same time remaining fairly heterogeneous. The teaching staff dedicated itself to the concept of continuous learning and attempted to "personalize" all insdruction. Through parent-pupil-teacher conferences, and the use of formal as well as informal testing devices, the learning needs were diagnosed, lessons were prescribed, and evaluations made. Pupil progress was reported to parents in conferences held at the end of each quarter.

The anabling legislation directed the State Department of Education to set up an evaluation design. Pupils at grade levels 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 were given the SRA Modern Math Understanding Tests and the Stanford Achievement Test in Reading in October, 1968 and September, 1969. The reading tests were also administered in May, 1969. The legislation provided for a minimum school year of 195 days and a maximum year of 200 days; each quarter approximately 50 days in length followed by a three-week vacation period.

In general, the reading tests have shown that the total number of months gained between October, 1968 and September, 1969 for the four-quarter school has exceeded the growth at a comparison school. An analysis of the mathematics test results of November, 1969, has shown that students in the four-quarter school have made significant gains over those in a comparison school. The data would seem to indicate that the continuous learning concept may very well have some effect upon student achievement.

At the conclusion of the first year of operation a second survey was made of parent, student, and community attitudes by evaluation consultants, General Behavioral Systems, Inc. Specific findings seem to indicate that the parents of children in the four-quarter school prefer the year-round program. Parents also indicated it was not too great a hardship to change vacation plans. About half of the school community felt that it is easier to plan their vacations during the four-quarter breaks. Half of the parents have always enrolled their youngsters in a summer school program. It is also the parents' general consensus that they would wish to keep their children better motivated, learn more, like school better, and are making much better progress in the new program. Parents have recommended that other elementary schools in the district change to the year-round school.

As part of the articulation and orientation program of the junior high school, the counselor interviewed all of the sixth grade students concerning their reactions and attitudes to the four-quarter plan. Nearly all of the sixth grade students concerning their reactions and attitudes to the four-quarter plan. Nearly 75 per cent of the children said that they liked school better under the new plan. They also felt that they liked the short vacations because they did not get bored. Seventy per cent of the students felt that the four-quarter plan should be continued. Many children, however, objected to being in classes without grades and disliked being in classes with children younger than themselves.

Teachers in the program report that their work has increased considerably because of the new organization. They feel that the four-quarter program does not interfere with their educational plans; in fact, they may ask for a leave during any quarter system, allowing them greater flexibility of course selection. Teachers overwhelmingly believe that the childrenget a better education in the program at this school and that there has been better utilization of textbooks and A-V materials. A majority of the teachers fell that there is more opportunity for parent-teacher conferencing. Most of the teachers indicate that they are continually stimulated to be more creative. They have done additional professional reading concerning the learning process of children. A summary of all other factors of the program is at a positive level with the teachers at the year-round school.

The business and industrial groups surveyed indicate that they are positive about the economic aspects of the program and fell that the schedule in no way interfered with the vacation plans of their companies. They felt that there were advantages in keeping children off the streets during the long traditional vacations and that a program such as this would provide opportunities to help slow learners as well as fast learners. These people were in favor of expanding the program to all schools in the district and 55 per cent of them indicated that they would like to have their own children in such a program.

Following the one-year operation of the year-round school, recommendations were made by the staff that the program be continued for a period of five years to conduct a longitudinal study of the program and its impact upon the students, parents, and community. The following factors would comprise the basic study:

An analysis of the achievement scores in mathematics, reading, language, science and social science be made as related to district and/or selected comparison schools' achievement levels.

In that it was only possible to study the financial aspects of this program for one year, a complete budgetary analysis should be conducted, using the systems approach of cost differentials of the four-quarter plan as compared to the regular elementary school year.

Continue the assessment of teacher, pupil, parent, and community reactions and perceptions of the program for a five-year period.

Study and develop inservice education activities which will enhance the understanding of all those participating in the extended year program and for those who may eventually become an active participant in the operation of the extended school year.

Conduct a study of the effect the four-quarter year has upon student achievement and adjustment as he continues his education at the junior high school level.

James R. Gove (administrator)

This report covers the planning and collection of baseline data for the beginning of a year-round school operation. The operation started on June 30, 1970, at Valley View School District, Lockport, Illinois. The district covers over forty square miles of primarily rural area in Will County, about one-half hour drive from the center of Chicago.

The district created the "45-15 Plan" which provides about 7,000 pupils, grades kindergarten through eight, 45 days of instruction and 15 equivalent school days of vacation. The cycle repeats four times each year. However, only one-fourth of the pupils are on vacation at any one time.

Baseline data included student achievement, teacher opinions, student descriptions of their classrooms, community opinions, and costs of operation. The data showed that the community entered the 45-15 plan with a strong feeling of support, though a few families were strongly against it. (These same families were critical of almost all features of the school district.) A few teachers were strongly against the plan, but many of those few indicated that they did not intend to remain in the district.

The initial cost analysis showed that savings might be as high as five per cent, primarily due to reduced debt retirement payments per pupil. Whatever the amount of the savings, it will be almost immediately realized because the one-third space increase generated by the 45-15 plan will be used up in about a year and a half or less. The population movement from the Chicago Metropolitan area will overrun the district in ten to twenty years. The enrollment may increase from 7,000 to 20,000 pupils by 1980.

Unlike earlier adoptions of year-round operations, this one can be researched in great depth because of the large quantity of data already collected on various features of the plan and the impact it may have on the community.

The Valley View experience shows that most school districts could implement a similar plan if three problems are solved well. These are student scheduling, teacher scheduling, and winning community support. Little else appeared to be a tough problem for district personnel and the school board to solve.

Mark Meyer (student)

I like the Park School four-quarter plan in many ways. A very good thing about it is you get a longer school year so you learn more. Also you have four short vacations instead of one in the summer. With the short vacation, you can remember better what you learned before the vacation. I feel the best thing about the four-quarter plan is that you work at your own speed and if you're smart enough you can go into harder work all by yourself. One other thing is that you are in classrooms with kids younger and older than yourself. If you are young and need help, the older kids can help you.

Kathy Lindstrom (student)

As a student I like the 45-15 plan. I think most of the kids in school like it too. The ones that don't probably dislike any kind of school. I don't know what it's like to go to school most of the summer, but I know it was a lot of fun to get out in the winter. We may take a trip to Florida next winter if my brother and sister go on the 45-15 plan. (High school in another district not on 45-15 plan)

I don't get to see a few of my old friends as often, but all my close friends are on the same track as me.

Some of the kids say they want a long summer vacation but they complained during the vacation that there wasn't anything to do.

A lot of people ask me, "Don't you forget things during your three week vacation?" They don't think about the three months we're off otherwise.

Our school has units, and each unit covers a different part of a subject. Like in math the unit might be addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division of decimals. When you come back after vacation you can start on something new and not get tired of the same old thing.

PRINCIPAL, PARENT REACTION

Hayward, California
Lockport, Illinois

Barney Moura Principal

The Park School is an extended school year, organized into four quarters of ten weeks in class for the children and three weeks of vacation. The Park School program was never meant to save money nor building space. It costs more and we have empty classrooms. The program was developed to reorganize curriculum, to offer enrichment that we never seemed to have time for in a graded program mandated by the State Legislature in a school year of 175 days, to reduce loss of learning from long summer vacations and thereby reduce the amount of review and reteaching each September, to offer shorter learning periods with more frequent short vacations to reduce student and teacher fatigue, to achieve better plant maintenance, more utilization of the plant, and to offer a vacation period other than the summers.

It is a compulsory four quarter school year for all children. The school is non-graded with multi-aged classes and individualized instruction. The children are divided into two groups, those that come at 9:00 a.m. and are dismissed at 2:05 p.m., and those that come at 10:00 a.m. and are dismissed at 3:15 p.m. The classes are grouped heterogeneously using two criteria: how the child fits into the peer group; how the child's personality fits the teacher's personality and whether the teacher's personality fits that of the child. The traditional report card was replaced by parent-teacher conferences.

The teacher's work year is one of eleven weeks each quarter with two weeks vacation three times a year and one vacation break of three weeks.

In this program, as principal, I feel we are giving the children a better educational program. They like school better, are not showing signs of fatigue, have no noticeable loss of learning and are ready to come back to school at the end of the three week vacation - even for the summer quarter.

Teachers are as much individuals as children. Some of the teachers after ten quarters are beginning to feel the long pull. Others seem to be able to function as well now as in the first quarter of operation and will, I'm sure, be able to go on quarter after quarter. Teacher fatigue did not and has not set in as it did in the September to June school year. Attendance at summer school was not possible in this structure to date. To offset the need of a teacher to take off a quarter or to attend college we are offering a three quarter or four quarter contract.

131

I like the Park program. As principal, I get one week off each quarter break three times and the full three weeks once. I like the shorter breaks more often - about the time I begin to run down there is a vacation week and I'm all ready to go again. I like what is happening to most of the children - increased self direction, self motivation, decision making, independence from teacher, independent study skills and at least an 80% reduction in the number of behavior referrals sent to my office from the classroom are all positive observable indications of good things happening to kids. I still get about the same number of referrals coming off the playground at recess time and during the lunch hour.

Personally, I never want to go back to a graded school program nor to a two semester school year. The four quarter program, as we have at the Park School, offers the opportunity for the State College to place student teachers in any quarter, even the summer quarter, and they have taken advantage of this which gives us returns in added personnel to do a better job with each individual child. We have happy parents operating our library continuously and also as volunteer tutors.

With the flexibility of the four quarters carrying the non-graded individualized instructional program for the kids, who wants to go back to a traditional school!!?

Ronald Fagan (Principal)

The 45-15 continuous school year plan allows a financially limited school district to more efficiently utilize its school facilities, professional staff, and financial resources to utmost efficiency in the fact of an over-expanding population.

With this plan only 3/4 of the entire student body is in school. The other 1/4 if on vacation. The number of classrooms made available under this plan increases by 33%. Therefore, 1/3 more students can be housed without double-sessions or overcrowded classrooms.

What are the implications of this plan to me as a building principal?

Since this plan has only been in effect since June 30, 1970, it is very difficult to evaluate the total program. I can give you some personal judgements on how teachers have reacted, how students feel about the plan, and how parents, to this point, have accepted this plan.

In any change that is to occur teachers must feel that they have a part in the decision making. This was evident in district #96. If we all want to be honest we say, what does this change mean to me? What effect will it have on me? The teachers at North View all had the opportunity to express their desires as to the length of the contract they would teach. Each primary teacher, grades K-3, indicated that, for the child's benefit, he should have but one teacher during the year. Therefore, all of these teachers teach a 180 day contract, 45 days teaching and 15 days vacation, just as their students when the student goes on vacation so do the teachers. The significance here is that all of the primary teachers "got what they wanted". Up to this point there has been no second thoughts. The rest of the staff, intermediate teachers, met and worked out their contracts, submitted them to me and were approved. I realize this seems "too good to be true", but did happen. Needless to say, contracts did not cause any problems that did not exist before. Teachers only concerned with storage as they moved to different rooms when they returned from vacation. This also was solved with the purchase of inexpensive storage cabinets on which their names and new room numbers were placed and moved by the custodians.

Materials is another problem, but I can't say that 45-15 was the cause. Teachers are always in need of materials for the fast or slow student no matter what plan they're on.

The students seem to be happier in school. They know that they only have 45 days to go. One community does not have park facilities, or for that matter, any facilities for the children. Therefore the 45-15 has given them an opportunity to be "patient" as they will be able to go to school in a short time. An evaluation sheet distributed to the teachers for their analysis of retention by students showed a positive response. The teachers felt that the students were better prepared upon returning to school. Discipline problems appear to be about the same.

At this point, there has been a minimal negative feed-back from parents. Vacation schedules have all been distributed and the parents know.

As a building principal for the past four years in District #96 I feel that responsibilities have not changed but have been extended (June to June) and expanded (more kids). I look ahead to the future and see no change, and think about how good I had it when on the last day of school in June I could breathe a sigh of relief and start preparing for the following year. But no more, there is no end and no beginning.

Charles Machado (Parent)

I definitely favor the Park continuous school year learning experience to the traditional school year with its long summer break because the Park program offers improved learning opportunities for the child. Vacation periods of three week durations four times a year provide short spans between the learning periods in school reducing time for any learning loss to occur. With less time required for review at the beginning of each quarter plus additional class days through a lengthened school calendar more time is available to each child for enrichment and/or remedial work.

The twelve weeks per year over which to plan and schedule vacations for the family allow opportunity for vacations to otherwise crowded facilities either immediately before or after the heavy tourist seasons and can help increase vacation enjoyment. The four short vacation periods may create vacation scheduling problems since only one school is on this schedule if a family has students attending another school or a parent teaching elsewhere.

Vacation periods of three weeks for the child seem to be of a good length in that the children are quite eager to return to school having worn thin the comparative idleness of vacations at home during that period of time and usually reaching the "what is there to do?" stage prior to the end of the vacation.

At Park the contract system is used which allows an opportunity for each child to learn to succeed at a given project or task, while providing sufficient flexibility to allow a teacher to impose more rigid assignments for that child unable to function and learn without such direction. The child is encouraged to set his own goals and to achieve them within a reasonable time, though these goals or time limits may be modified by the teacher either upward or downward as indicated.

The non-graded classroom and individualized instruction allow the child to progress at his own speed and provide opportunity for broadened learning experiences or enrichment when appropriate. That child who may need additional help from the teacher or remedial work can get the additional time necessary because the child progressing at a good pace and without problems and not demanding attention frees the teacher to devote the time and attention where it can best be used.

Parent-teacher conferences provide a convenient vehicle for appraising the parents of student progress and serve as an opportunity for exchange of thoughts should questions or problems arise without making the child excessively aware of grades.

My wife and I have one child in her third year of the Park Program as an upper elementary student, and one child who after completing two years under this Plan moved on into junior high school last fall and are both very pleased with the results of our childrens experiences at Park.

Harold Lindstrom (Parent)

As a parent and a businessman I am happy to see our district go to a year round school program. It would be impossible to operate any other business for nine months, leaving it idle for three months, this would not only be a waste of building utilization, but would also prove to be a difficult problem in hiring personnel.

I believe a school system is a large business. As a taxpayer I feel I have an interest in this business and would like to see my money well spent. Year round school does both things a business must do. It does utilize buildings to the full extend and it provides the personnel with the full time job they are trained to do - teach. Teachers are not forced to seek a different job for the summer; perhaps losing some of the skill in their own profession.

I think our school system started year round school to save money on buildings, but I can see other benefits that may not have been anticipated. Some of these are:

Better retention on the part of the student on a shorter vacation period. Vacations can be planned for any season in the year. Children do not become bored during a long summer vacation, and they seem to enjoy school for the 45 day period knowing a vacation is not too far away.

People in our community actually see a taxing body doing something to save them money -- an uncommon thing today. The 45-15 plan has pulled our community closer to the school system than ever before. We are proud of the system that is willing to try something to save us money.

Of course, the publicity our district has received has helped, everyone seems to be interested in the 45-15 Plan, even Chicago is looking at it. People in the community take pride in this. They feel a part of it.

The plan is working.

TEACHER, SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER REACTION

Hayward
Valley View

Bonnie Logsdon (Teacher)

A teacher is constantly confronted with the realization of "there must be a better way" to meet the academic and emotional needs of her students. We need more time for enrichment; more time to alleviate the pressures of having too much to teach in a given area.

I watched the dream of the quarter plan, which would give us that needed time, grow into reality, and I have enjoyed the privilege of being a member of the Park-four-quarter team during its first 10 quarters of operation.

During the year of the feasibility study, Park teachers worked closely with the administrators in making our community aware of the possible advantages that an extended school year could bring to their children. At the same time everyone was reading, discussing, planning, and sharing ideas, hoping to implement the best program available to fit into our new concept of time.

In September, 1968, we organized our first quarter on a non-graded basis with two and three-year age spans in each classroom. The teaching staff dedicated itself to the concept of continuous learning and to "personalizing" all instruction.

Specific findings at this fime, indicate that parents and children, alike, prefer the year-round program. Teachers find the short break between quarters a help in planning and organizing for the following quarter. They also enjoy the rest that is so necessary after shorter intervals.

Our children's discipline has improved. They learn self-direction so quickly and strive to improve themselves. They are eager to return following a three-week break and they seem reluctant to have vacation time begin.

I feel that we, at Park, have found, in the quarter plan, a "right" tool to use in educating children.

Jamie McGee (Teacher)

As a teacher first thinks of a continuous year program he realizes he has a chance of working full-time at a job he is qualified to do. No more will a teacher have to seek summer employment in some other endeavor to supplement his income. With the advent of the continuous year program, a teacher can obtain a flexible schedule. He has the opportunity of getting a contract from 180 to 240 days. Also a teacher may choose to take the same schedule as the students and have 45 days in school and 15 days vacation. The teacher also has the opportunity of scheduling a vacation in their extended contract.

Although we haven't had testing to verify this as yet, the students seem to have regressed less after they come back from their 15 day vacations than they did after coming back from a three month vacation. With 45 days in school and their 15 day vacation, the students don't seem to get as bored with school by the nine weeks as they did going all year. The 15 day vacations are apparently long enough time from school work to refresh the students because when they come back they seem eager to get started again. One student remarked that it seemed like having four short school years instead of one long one.

Several teachers have commented that they enjoy having the break after nine weeks of work. There isn't the fatigue factor that gets to teachers in the later part of the year of the traditional school year. Also the opportunity to take a vacation at different seasons of the year, i.e. having a skiing vacation which wasn't possible on the traditional year program.

Especially at the junior high, it gives a teacher on an extended contract the opportunity to become acquainted with more of the students, when you get another set of students every 45 days. If the teacher feels he needs to have the students all year long to better enable him to know the individual student better, that scheduling can be accomplished also.

After approximately a year in the 45-15 phase, the biggest complaint I hear is from the teachers who follow this students schedule of 45 days of school and then 15 days of vacation. The teacher doesn't have a room to call her own. Of course, if we had the rooms available to begin with, there would not have been the need for the 45-15 plan.

Suzanne Clemmers (Board Member)

Whenever a new or innovative idea is brought before our board of education, it is first necessary for us to look with particular care at the cost before we can consider its merits since we are a financially impoverished district. However, for once our board has been able to support an enrichment program for our children thru funds received from ESEA Title III and special enabling legislation passed by the California State Legislature. After our original pilot venture we now have a bill signed into law in 1970 continuing our special grant through the 1974-75 school year.

Our concept is to give children an extended school year for the purpose of greater in-depth and personalized instruction. Park has become the truly inovative school in our district. As we continue evaluating the plan I feel we may use some of its imaginative aspects (ungraded classrooms, student contracts, etc.) within the framework of our regular school program.

After much planning by the principal and teachers, and many meetings with staff, parents and the Board of Education it was abundantly clear that we had community support to move ahead.

The board has had no reason to regret our decision. If the funding was available there is no reason to believe we could expand to other elementary schools and other grade levels. The cost for the Park 4-quarter plan runs about 10 per cent above the traditional two semester school program available to all other students in our district.

We have a dwindling enrollment in Hayward so that the urgency of needed additional schoolrooms has never been considered as any part of our plan. We are convinced of the worth of enriched education for boys and girls plus the active support and involvement of the parental community as indication for us to continue the program.

James D. Bingle (Board Member)

Less than two months after the implementation of the Valley View 45-15 Continuous School Year Plan on June 30, 1970, residents of the school district had an excellent opportunity to express their collective displeasure with the changed system if they so desired. On August 15, only 4 days after the third of the four tracks of students had interrupted their normal summer vacations to go back to school, Valley View District 96 went to the public with a 3-part building referendum. Although the referendum was only peripherally related to 45-15, unhappiness with the 45-15 Plan would certainly have been shown by a negative vote, since this is traditionally the way the public expresses its feeling on any issue.

While the very favorable outcome of the referendum (all 3 issues carried by substantial margins) cannot be said to be a particular endorsement of the Valley View 45-15 Plan, it does show that the community was not necessarily immediately alienated by the Plan, which, in reality, has brought far-reaching changes to everyone's way of life. The residents are apparently at least adopting a wait-and-see attitude as to the merits of year-round schools.

Although 45-15 was designed for just one particular school district, there is no doubt that it may have applicability for other districts as well. As a school board member, I would offer a few words of advice to those who would consider it elsewhere:

1. Allow plenty of time. At least two years should be allowed from the first consideration of the plan until its implementation. There are many details, each of which must be resolved before that first day of school under the new system.

2. Let the community think it is their idea. Go to the public with the alternatives, which are usually a) costly building programs, if you have the bonding power, b) double sessions, c) 50 or more children in a classroom, or d) some form of year-round schools. You will be surprised how rapidly the community will agree that year-round schools may be the best solution.
3. Don't let your school administration scare you off. In our district, we are blessed with an administration that is not afraid of change, when change is necessary. But our research has shown that it is often school administrators that have in the past dragged their feet over school calendar reform.
4. Involve your teachers. Year-round will be a big change in their lives and yet it promises to be of great financial benefit to them. Let teachers participate in the planning and scheduling; in fact, insist on it.
5. Keep the public informed. Once you decide to adopt a year-round school system, don't stop communicating. Let everyone know as each step down the road is taken towards that first day of school. It is of vital importance to retain the confidence of the public.

Certainly, the transition to year-round schools in District 96 was not perfect, and yet it was smoother than most of us thought possible. We feel that the transition was accomplished so satisfactorily because it was a team effort -- Board, Administration, Teachers, and Public -- all working together for the good of the children. That is the only way it can succeed.

A REPORT. . .
PENNSYLVANIA
ONE YEAR LATER

Dr. John McLain
H. Stanley Wills
Dr. John L. Kennedy
Jack Whipple

McLain

One of the key characteristics of the National Seminar on Year-round Education - its first year in Fayetteville, Arkansas, last year in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, and now in Cocoa Beach, Florida, is the honest and open-ended approach of trying to seek out answers to problems. We have intentionally brought out the many facets of this complex problem and sought varying points about each issue.

This gave a great many people in Pennsylvania an opportunity to learn a lot about the question of year-round education. Another very key factor is that we have not only sought diversity, but we have also sought commonality-the main ideas that we can agree upon were spelled out and adopted as the Statement on Year-round Education, which appears in the printed program.

In Pennsylvania, this was endorsed by our Pennsylvania Department of Education Committee on Year-round Education., the Task Force on Education of the Governor's Committee on Children and Youth (and this was endorsed heartily by the youth members of the Task Force, incidently), The Pennsylvania Education Association, and the essence of the statement was adopted by the Pennsylvania Chamber of Commerce.

Out of this came the Pennsylvania Council on Year-round Education, with the purpose of putting these recommendations of the Statement on Year-round Education into operation. The Officers are : John Kennedy, as president, Stan Wills, as Program Chairman, Jack Whipple, as membership chairmen, and I am executive secretary.

Kennedy

I probably can best describe the Pennsylvania State Department of Education feeling since last year's second national conference by quoting a newspaper headline that appeared in the Harrisburg paper during our first state meeting: "Wanted a Pilot School District". The Pennsylvania State Department of Education recognizes the increased pressure to improve the quality of Education in our public schools and the need to visualize our public school. facilities on a year-round basis. We are of the opinion that both of these can be achieved through programs such as we have heard described here. We also recognize the need for some enabling legislation that will enhance the possibility of these schools who have a commitment to trying some form of year round education.

For this reason, we are looking for and have received at the present time requests from ten separate school districts to assist them in trying to develop some pilot programs. We feel that this activity will assist us in identifying those problem areas that arise beoause of present legislation or State Board of Education regulation. We can sit in our offices and dream about what needs to be done, but we will never really know unless we work with a real live school district and let the need for change develop from within a practical situation.

The Pennsylvania State Department has also taken the stand publicly that year-round education will not save money as far as reducing the total amount of dollars spent per year but will in fact reduce the growth factor of the school district budget over a ten year period, and at the same time increase the amount and quality of education for the dollar spent.

It has taken us a year to bring about a genuine interest on the part of ten schools but, we are committed to help with all the forces and funds we can muster. These next few years can be very exciting in Pennsylvania. Our Secretary of Education and Commission for Basic Education have both pledged their support in experimenting with this concept. We will move ahead.

Wills

In 1969 the Pennsylvania State Education Association appointed a Year-Round Education Committee with H. Stanley Wills assigned as the PSEA staff consultant. The specific responsibilities assigned to the committee are:

Purpose: To study the reasoning for and against the use of educational facilities beyond the usual 180 days and to establish a PSEA position on the subject.

Questions:
1. What are the laws that relate to the school year?
2. What are the regulations that relate to the school year?
3. What reasons are there for changing the present school year?
4. What are the reasons for not extending the students school year? the Teachers?
5. What would be the effect of year-round education on: finances, curriculum, teaching (instruction), department of education, administration, supervisors, teachers, higher education, pupil services, parents, students, and the community, including employers and recreation areas.
6. Suggest a position paper for the PSEA on this subject.

Whipple

In the fall of 1969 the Board of Directors of the Pennsylvania Chamber of Commerce requested that the Chamber's Education Committee examine and evaluate the feasibility of year-round education.

Shortly thereafter a Subcommittee on Year-Round Education was appointed. Over the past fourteen months the Subcommittee has met on several occasions, read a large volume of material on the subject, and discussed the concept with school administrators, teachers, parents and students in Pennsylvania. Representatives attended last year's National Seminar in Harrisburg and the Pennsylvania State Conference held in February of this year in Hershey. In addition, early last fall the Pennsylvania Chamber joined the Pennsylvania Council on Year-Round Education which, in turn, sponsored the State Conference.

Based on this study, the Subcommittee, the Parent Education Committee, and on March 9, 1971, the Board of Directors endorsed year-round education.

Following is the official policy statement as adopted:

Modern Schedules for Learning

The Pennsylvania Chamber of Commerce has thoroughly examined and evaluated existing and proposed plans and programs relating to the operation of school facilities throughout twelve months of the year.

Based on this examination and evaluation, the Pennsylvania Chamber of Commerce fully endorses the flexible scheduling of school calendars and facilities.

The Pennsylvania Chamber endorses such usage with the primary recognition that maximum efficiency in today's educational efforts requires the full utilization of high-cost facilities on a twelve-month basis.

Related advantages to such use could include a more flexible teacher salary schedule, providing a closer relationship between instructional time and salary schedules for teachers employed on a full-year schedule as compared with those employed on less than a twelve-month basis staggered vacation schedules resulting in improved and expanded employment opportunities for students; strengthened educational programs by possibly reducing the amount of school time required for courses of lesser importance, the availability of more time for additional elective courses, and the opportunity for the slow learner to master a particular skill; and reduce duplication of teaching efforts through at least partial elimination of the annual review of the previous year's work.

It must be emphaszied, however, that flexible scheduling may not necessarily serve as a cost-serving device. Rather, educational productibity may be increased considerably through the usage of such scheduling.

As I am sure you noted, we feel the true "selling" point for year-round education lies in educational and not financial benefits.

At present, the Pennsylvania Chamber of Commerce has available upon request packets of reproduced publications used as source materials for our study of year-round education. In addition, a 24 color slide set with accompanying taped script entitled "The Pennsylvania Chamber of Commerce Looks at Year-Round Education" is available at a minimum price.

We at the Chamber look forward with much enthusiasm and interest to another State Conference on year-round education in Pennsylvania next year and the Fourth National Seminar on Year-Round Education.

McLain

Pennsylvania State Secretary of Education, Joseph Kuntzman, in his concluding remarks at our First State Conference on Year-Round Education, stated: "We frequently refer to year-round education. I prefer the term 'flexible school year' because in the final analysis it is flexibility that we must achieve, both in terms of the time in school and the learning experiences of students."

Frank Brown, in his address at the opening session of this National Seminar, stressed over and over again the need for better use of time as well as a closer tie and better working relationship between the school and the community.

The Carnagie Commission on Education, in a recent report, made what I believe to be a very significant point. They stated: "Schools need to be more a part of all of life and less the all of part of life."

This implies, I believe, that schools must be concerned about the educational needs of learners, not just part of the year, but all of the year, not just part of life but life-time.

We in Pennsylvania are working together toward that goal--the Department of Education, the Education Association, the Chamber of Commerce, the Legislature--the Council on Year-Round Education embracing all statewide organizations interested in the organization of school. We have benefited greatly by hosting the National Seminar on Year-Round Education because it helped make us a team--and as a team we can do a much better job than if we were working separately.

I have to put in a plug for my own institution, Clarion State College. We now have under construction at Clarion a new Research-Learning Center. It is expected to be in operation in 1972 and will house a research-demonstration model of the flexible all-year school. It will not be an eleven month school, a four-quarter school, or a 45-15 school. It will be a school with no beginning and no ending, with time in school and the curriculum adapted to the needs of the individual. It will operate continuously in such a way that any student, or teacher, can take his vacation any time he needs it, and within reasonable limitations, for whatever length of time he needs. The school will be the center of learning the community--the human environment--will be the classroom. This Center will serve as the State Center on Year-Round Education to help local school systems analyze their needs as they develop more realistic schools atuned to the needs of our society.

HUMANE YEAR-ROUND SCHOOLS

Dr. Donald Glines

The concept of the humane year-round school will be accepted and well on the way to nationwide adoption by 1980, if we are patient and continue to provide national leadership to the movement. There appears to be little doubt that in 1971 such a trend is developing. In the meantime, there are two frustrations: (1) Those who want such a program right now are currently fighting against the odds; and (2) unfortunately, no year-round program in operation yet provides complete answers. Therefore, needed immediately is a strong committment from more educational and lay leaders that the concept of the year-round school makes tremendous sense even in 1971. We must see that new relevant plans are created and implemented; basic year-round school blueprints must be developed with much more flexibility than provided in present plans so that the ideas can more readily be modified and utilized rapidly in any district throughput the United States.

The 45-15 plan is not the answer, nor is the quarter system, nor the multiple trails plan, nor the Wilson plan, nor any other now in operation or on paper. None meet the needs of most communities. The current Wilson model comes closer to the ultimate in curriculum and flexibility, but it presently lacks the mechanisms to handle space and budget crises. The 45-15 solves immediate building problems, but is of otherwise little value if the curriculum does not drastically change. Similar comments could be made about all such current efforts. What is needed is to take the best of the existing operational or paper proposals and develop some combinations that more nearly reach toward the ultimate. These plans must be ones that can be adopted by segments of the community almost overnight. The two and three year district studies such as have been conducted in several Michigan communities have been necessary and valuable in the initial stages, but if every district must repeat three year feasibility studies, the movement will still be struggling in the year 2000. What is dramatically needed now are immediate action implementation efforts in many states.

The year-round school must provide more options and alternatives for students than presently available in the monopolistic police state neighborhood public schools. Not all students, parents, and teachers should be forced into the same mold in the district; otherwise, the new efforts will be a repetition of the mistakes made in developing the present conventional school systems.

The year-round movement is mandatory for both "traditional" and "innovative" school patterns. But if we are ever to develop truly humane schools, where individual persons are really given actual personal consideration, then the all year school is an absolute necessity. For example, in Minnesota temperatures of minus 30, heavy snowfall, blowing snow, and high drifts are not uncommon during the winter. Many Minnesota families would like to take their vacation in January or February. For some, such as the carpenter, this is the ideal time, when the construction industry is forced to a slowdown by the weather. But if a family is locked into a conventional school system, can they take a leisurely trip to Florida during the winter? Of course not! My goodness, a seven-year-old just could not possibly afford to miss two months of those wonderful 2-2 basal readers, nor could a 17-year-old miss two months of United States History. The only way they escape is by penalties, make-up work, summer school, and all the other negative responses. The usual pattern, then, is for the family to stay home. But are schools in Florida any better? Can students there go to Minnesota for snowmobiling, ice skating, ice fishing, skiing, and other outdoor winter activities? Absolutely not! The required Florida curriculum, credits, and attendance regulations are generally as rigid as those in Minnesota so that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for a student to be gone large amounts of time between September and June, and still "pass" to the next grade level, especially in districts which fail to provide extensive summer school opportunities.

Unfortunately, the nine month schools labeled "innovative" have not done much better than "conventional" schools in this respect. Modular scheduling, team teaching, open facility construction, independent study, nongrading, efforts at individualizing instruction, self-pacing, concern over the affective domain, revised curriculum content, new materials from publishers, hand developed teacher packets, and so many more such elements have been in most cases sincere efforts to improve education. In many situations better programs have evolved, but unfortunately, the majority of these efforts have not been of enough value to show significant improvement. One of the major difficulties is that schools have adopted only a few of the changes available to them. There must be massive adoption in a school, as all of the above mentioned "innovative gimmicks" weave together. One can seldom really succeed without the other; and as practically none of the flexible team schools which have gained a national reputation have instituted year-round programs, they really are not yet completely humane schools. They have left out an essential ingredient for a creative, exciting, individualized environment.

Innovative schools--at least schools that dramatically break the pattern of the conventional North American school organization of self-contained elementary rooms and 55 minute period high schools--are relatively easy to start. It takes dissatisfaction--the school must improve; it takes commitment--we can develop a better approach; it takes self confidence--we can solve problems as they arise; and it takes hard work--the willingness to endure many 26-hour days in the initial efforts of each revision.

The most important factor, though, is a belief in options--in alternatives. Every school district must provide alternative learning and environmental styles for individual students, teachers, and parents. Few districts in the United States have done this, and as a result the neighborhood police state has continued even in liberal communities. The general pattern for years has been to force everyone to go to the neighborhood school--which unfortunately was organized just like every other neighborhood school. Even if it were different, students in that area of the district were still forced into one mold. It is essential that we provide for options. If this is done, innovative, humane, year-round schools can be developed overnight in every community. If the insistence remains on "sameness," not only is change made terribly difficult, but in addition, the monopolistic pattern of requiring students to go to one school, follow one pattern of requirements, and spend three months in a summer lockout will continue.

There are three easy ways to break the community lockstep of conventional or innovative nine month schools. Obviously there are more than three, but these patterns offer easily illustrated, practical, immediately operational examples. The logistics, mechanisms, salesmanship problems vary from district to district depending upon size and other community factors. However, these "models" can be modified to work in almost every district in the United States.

Probably the easist way to start an open innovative year-round school is to do as was done at Wilson. One school in the district was made an open attendance area for the entire city. In other words, one school became a volunteer enrollment program so that those students, parents, and teachers who could best fit in an open flexible school could enroll. Those who preferred the conventional mold were allowed to stay in that environment. The two things wrong yet in Mankato are that another Wilson has not yet been formed, for Wilson has a waiting list, and second that there is no middle-of-the road school. Each district needs one or more open, middle-of-the-road, and conventional structured school approaches, for in 1971 some students fit best into these various molds. In addition, the public schools need to offer small "free" school opportunities for students who,work best where they can create their own environment. This can be done simply by renting a big house, for example. Further, in large districts with many extremely alienated youth, a Person Center must be established--where human relations, social awareness, and rehabilitation efforts are the focus. But all districts, regardless of size, must have at least open, moderate, and structured opportunities if true individualization is to take place. One way to do it then is for one entire school to become open, one moderate, and one structured, and then allow students to attend the school of their choice.

Another way to accomplish the same alternatives is to develop the school-within-a-school concept. It retains the neighborhood flavor, avoids transportation problems, provides easy change from one program to another, and breaks large schools into smaller units. It can even be done in a small school where only a few teachers and students are available for the program. The disadvantages are conflicts among faculty over philosophy and the sharing of special facilities.

A third method is to develop an open Wilson style program, but with options within it. As students enroll they can choose to operate all or some of their program in Option 1--a completely free atmosphere where they can pretty much do what they want, only obeying the stop signs and speed limits of the school; or they can choose Option 2, which might be a similar open, flexible model but with more restrictions such as quarterly evaluations; Option 3 could be planned program where daily the student and advisor interact to determine a possible schedule for that day; Option 4 could be a closed approach, where in some or all subjects the student would be expected to report as scheduled and engage in prescribed work. This then gives each student individual options varying from complete openness to fairly tight structure. However, to make this work, the school must have an open flexible organization which will allow for all these alternatives. Another approach is for a district to follow an already developed model, such as the one proposed by the National Association of Secondary School Principals under the direction of Dr. J. Lloyd Trump.

Perhaps the best way to encourage schools to venture into open, human year-round approaches to education is to briefly describe the efforts at Wilson. This is not the best school in the country. It is a small school with many problems, but it has been a success story in the overnight achievement of immediate dramatic change. Relating some of these efforts should encourage others to start, or continue their own present innovative efforts, or to lead the way far beyond those attempted at Wilson. The following description will be brief. Those who are interested in complete detail are referred to the revised edition of Implementing Different and Better Schools, by Don Glines, now titled Creating Humane Schools. (Campus Publishers, Box 1005, Mankato, Minnesota, 1971, $5.00)

Much of what Wilson has to offer the nation is an example of how rapid, massive change can occur in a school. In July, 1968, Wilson was a good conventional school with a self-contained elementary section, and a 55-minute period hall pass, bell ringing, study hall type of high school section. Report cards were given, the school was a neighborhood attendance area, the facilities were eggcrate, the staff was hired, the budget was set, the special education students were separated, and there were dress codes, attendance regulations, athletic eligibility rules, and all the rest of the ritual that clutters up most schools in the United States. By September of 1968, in two short months, all this had changed to a new philosophy. Implementation factors and refinements have continued to change and improve, but the approach was achieved in a very short period of time. It is now in its third year, still struggling, and still trying to find some answers.

In summarizing current results, certainly the human relations factors have become vital keys. Students select their own teachers/adults/persons/motivators/guides; they select their own study experiences--no "courses" are required. The school believes the affective domain is the most important, followed by the psychomotor, and then the cognitive. Therefore in the early years of school, for example, self-image and success are most important, and physical education, home economics, and industrial arts are more important than reading and math. The cognitive comes easily if the affective and psychomotor domains are in good shape.

However, the cognitive must be self paced and/or individualized for each student. Individualization can easily include 1-1 conference, open lab, independent study, small groups of 5-6, and occasionally a common thread large group. Discovering relevant meaningful material, the process of learning, and learning that learning can be fun are much more important than prescribed teacher and/or textbook content. Individualization makes greater provision for creativity and learning styles.

At Wilson there is optional attendance and open campus for all. The school is completely nongraded--"kindergarten" age students mingle and study with "senior" age students. There are no dress codes, attendance notes from home study halls, bells, or other such nonsense. Each day a new smorgasbord schedule is developed, based upon the needs of individuals and groups for that day. There are no report cards, even for seniors, and state course requirements for graduation are not followed. No credits, class ranks, grade point averages, or other badges of discrimination are given.

Every effort is being made to interrelate curricula; teams such as the Expressive, Systems, Environmental, and Communication have been formed to break down subject discipline and grade separation. Teachers "teach" or "learn" in another area of the schoo school at least one day a week. Thus a former math teacher now in the Systems Team might work in the Environmental Team one day a week, one time "teaching" in traditional home economics areas and the next time "learning" in industrial arts. The physical environment has been enhanced by carpets, plants, animals, and bright colors. Early childhood programs, open athletic eligibility, mixing of the special and regular students, sending students to Mexico, and other such steps have been taken to enhance the chances of success.

The above sketched chances thus permitted the development of a more humane year-round school. Individualization, self-pacing, optional attendance, choice of studies, and the other 64 or so revisions made at Wilson provided the avenues for students to plub in, plug out, speed up, slow down, start, stop, and continue whenever they so desire. Thus a student can start typing on a Thursday in November and work at his own pace and program until December. He can then leave and go to Florida for January and February, returning in March to continue his typing right on through July, August, and September if he desires. There are no worries about finishing by June, registering in September, failing to receive a credit, or other. Students can graduate early; there is no need for many of the students to sit through 175 days for four years just to get a diploma.

There should be a Wilson type program in every community, but there should be programs with more structure for those who cannot handle the degree of decision making and responsibility. Either one or more entire schools, or the school-within-a-school, or the free, open, planned, and closed options within the individualized year-round school should be available to all students. Thus this discussion about the need for more humane year-round schools, and the machanisms for achieving them, ultimately must lead to one basic question: Where are we headed in the future?

Obviously the answers are not simple, but in trying to analyze long-range developments, the crystal ball reflection offered here at this moment in time is that more and more communities are going to offer Wilson type alternatives. More and more are going to offer year-round schools, taking the flexibility of the Wilson approach in individualization and combining it with space and cost factors so carefully considered in some of the other present year-round approaches.

The school in the community and the lighted school will become accepted parts of the year-round school movement. More money will be spent in the areas of research and evaluation. No longer can we continue to spend only one quarter of one per cent of the national education budget on research. The evaluation which takes place will stress the affective and psychomotor domains as much as the cognitive. No longer will achievement tests in so-called basic skills subjects continue to cloud the accountability issue. The former "non-academic" subjects will gain par with the presently labeled "important"subjects. Curriculum efforts will be interrelated; separate subjects and departments will be eliminated.

Perhaps most important of all, if the above are to succeed, is the complete reorganization of college and university education in its totality. The archaic college structures no longer can survive. They are being attacked at every angle; the movement is just beginning, but in ten years, great strides will have been taken. Many of the federally sponsored government model teacher education programs will be operational.

To show that this is happening, even schools such as Mankato State are moving. The college has just abolished the grade of F. Many courses can be taken on a pass/no-credit basis. In teacher education, the ridiculous ten or twelve department structure that has paralyzed teacher education and teacher certification for years (elementary, secondary, educational administration, educational psychology, and other such department misnomers) is being scrapped. At Mankato State College, the ten isolated departments are being replaced by four interrelated centers.

As part of one of these centers, the program for conceptual and evolving ideas is operationalizing in September a freshman through graduate open, flexible, year-round individualized teacher and administrator education program patterned after the Wilson model. If successful it could help provide the push for some immediately operational revolutions in teacher education and ultimately a redesign of the old ivy towers of tradition.

Will all this be successful nationally? If you look at 1970, the answer is no. Education nationally has been in an actionless plateau. The dramatic reorganizations of the 60ls--team teaching, flexible scheduling, nongrading, and all, have leveled off. Now we are in a period of talking, planning, and frustration. Little seems to be happening. But if we can look ahead to 1980, there should be clearly visible an entirely new design in education emerging. It takes patience to wait until 1980, but to reach that vision, it also takes action during the 70's.

We can probably best summarize that need for action by quoting from one of John F. Kennedy's most memorable addresses. Speaking about the atomic control treaty, Kennedy said: "But history and our own conscience will judge us harshly if we do not make every effort to test our hopes by action. According to an ancient Chinese proverb, 'a journey of a thousand miles must begin with a single step.' And if that journey is 1,000 miles or even more, let history record, that we, in this land, at this time, took that first step."

Here then is clearly the call. We must accept that challenge related to immediate action implementation of the year-round school in communities all over the U.S. We must stop the philosophy of the past 30 years which has said, "we would like to, but....". No longer can we make excuses. No longer can we let such a tone stifle education in the United States. Instead we need to say, "what are the priorities; what are the steps that we can immediately take to start............".

We as educators must now accept the challenge. We must state: "Let history record that we in this land, at this time, took that first step along the 1,000 miles ahead toward the success of the year-round school. History and our own conscience will judge us harshly if we do not make every effort to test our hopes by action." We all have the obligation to looktoward 1972 with heads held high, and with the ability to say that we took that first step--that we do have the start of the year-round school underway in every state, and ultimately, in the years ahead, in every district. We must test our beliefs by action.

SEMINAR FACULTY

Sami J. Alam, Director for Research and Evaluation, Port Huron Area School District, 509 Stanton Street, Port Huron, Michigan 48060

Raymond G. Arveson, Superintendent, Hayward Unified School District, P. O. Box 5000, Hayward, California 94544

Clyde Baer, Assistant Superintendent, School District of Kansas City, 1211 McGee Street Kansas City, Missouri 64106

Jarvis Barnes, Assistant Superintendent for Research and Development, Atlanta Public Schools, 224 Central Avenue, S.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303

James Bingle, Board Member, Valley View Public Schools, District #96, Dalhart Avenue, Lockport, Illinois 60441

B. Frank Brown, Director, Information and Services Division, Institute for the Development of Educational Activities I/D/E/A, P. O. Box 446, Melbourne, Florida 32901

Earl Busard, Business Manager, Northville Public Schools, 405 West Main Street, Northville, Michigan 48167

J. C. Cantrell, Director, Elective Quarter Plan, Jefferson County Public Schools, 3332 Newburg Road, Louisville, Kentucky 40218

Tom Chapman, Area Superintent, Broward County School District, 1320 Southwest Fourth Street, Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33310

C. M. Clark, Assistant Superintendent, Bradford County School District, Drawer 100, Starke, Florida 32091

Suzanne Clemens, Board Member, Hayward Unified School District, P. O. Box 5000, Hayward, California 94544

Cathy Clemmer, student, Briarwood High School, Fulton County School System, East Point, Georgia

Ruth Duncan, Assistant Principal for Curriculum, Gainesville High School, 1900 N.W. 13th Street, Gainesville, Florida 32601

Ronald Fagan, Principal, North View Elementary School, Valley View Public Schools, Lockport, Illinois

Don Glines, Director, Wilson School, Mankato State College, Mankato, Minnesota 56001

George Glinke, Administrative Assistant for Year-Round School Study, Utica Community Schools, 52188 Van Dyke, Utica, Michigan 48087

James R. Gove, Assistant Superintendent, Valley View Public Schools, District #96, Dalhart Avenue, Lockport, Illinois 60441

Kenneth Hermansen, Superintendent, Valley View Public Schools, District #96, Dalhart Avenue, Lockport, Illinois 60441

Ned S. Hubbell, Public Relations Counselor, Ned S. Hubbell & Associates, 1918 Pine Grove Avenue, Port Huron, Michigan 48060

George M. Jensen, Chairman, National School Calendar Study Committee, P. O. Box 38, Horse Shoe, North Carolina 28742

R. L. Johns, Professor of Education, University of Florida, Normal Hall, Room 254, Gainesville, Florida 32601

David Johnson, student, Doss High School, Jefferson County Public Schools, Louisville, Kentucky

Oz Johnson, Assistant Superintendent for Research, Jefferson County Public Schools, 3332 Newburg Road, Louisville, Kentucky 40218

John L. Kennedy, Director, Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation, Pennsylvania Department of Education, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Harold Lindstrom, parent, West View Junior High School, Valley View Public Schools, Lockport, Illinois

Kathy Lindstrom, student, West View Junior High School, Valley View Public Schools, Lockport, Illinois

Reece Little, social studies teacher, Southern High School, Jefferson County Public Schools, Louisville, Kentucky

Bonnie Logsdon, teacher, Park School, Hayward Unified School District, Hayward, California

Charles Machado, parent, Park School, Hayward Unified School District, Hayward, California

Mark Meyer, student, Park School, Hayward Unified School District, Hayward, California

Max E. McBrayer, Principal, Briarwood High School, Fulton County School System, East Point, Georgia

Jamie McGee, President, District Education Association, Valley View Public Schools, Lockport, Illinois

John McLain, Director, Research-Learning Center, Clarion State College, Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214

Thomas J. Moe, Coordinator of Instructional Programs, Clay County School District, P. O. Box 488, Green Cove Springs, Florida 32034

Barney Moura, Principal, Park School, Hayward Unified School District, Hayward, California

Alan M. O'Dell, Administrative Assistant, Elementary Education, Francis Howell School District, Route 2, St. Charles, Missouri 63301

Frances Padgett, Chairman, English Department, Briarwood High School, Fulton County School System, East Point, Georgia

Glen H. Penner, Administrative Assistant, Saskatoon Public Schools, 405 Third Avenue South, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada

Wendell H. Pierce, Executive Director, Education Commission of the States, 922 Lincoln Building, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203

Thomas E. Putnam, Educational Consultant, P. O. Box 14, Melbourne, Florida 32901

Martin Rubinstein, Quinmester Project Manager, Dade County Public Schools, 1410 N.E. Second Avenue, Miami, Florida 33132

Raymond E. Spear, Superintendent, Northville Public Schools, 405 West Main Street, Northville, Michigan 48167

Richard VanHoose, Superintendent, Jefferson County Public Schools, 3332 Newburg Road, Louisville, Kentucky 40218

Paul D. West, Superintendent, Fulton County School System, 786 Cleveland Avenue S.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30315

Jack Whipple, Education Coordinator, Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, 222 North Third Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101

Robert Williams, Director of Elementary Education, Hayward Unified School District, P. O. Box 5000, Hayward, California 94544

Benjamin C. Willis, Superintendent, Broward County School District, 1320 Southwest Fourth Street, Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33310

Stan Wills, Director, Basic Education, Pennsylvania State Education Association, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Wayne M. Worner, Superintendent, Grand Forks Public Schools, 115 North Fourth Street, Grand Forks, North Dakota 58201

SEMINAR STAFF

Co-Sponsors
Floyd T. Christian, Commissioner of Education, Florida Department of Education,
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

C. C. Miller, Dean, College of Education, Florida Technological University, P. O. Box
25000, Orlando, Florida 32816

Wayne H. White, Superintendent, Brevard County School District, 3205 South Washington
Avenue, Titusville, Florida 32780

Director
R. Dale Weizenecker, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, Brevard County
School District, 3205 South Washington Avenue, Titusville, Florida 32780

Conference Coordinator
Van H. Savell, Communications Administrator, Brevard County School District,
3205 South Washington Avenue, Titusville, Florida 32780

Treasurer
Richard A. Bolinger, Controller, Brevard County School District, 3205 South
Washington Avenue, Titusville, Florida 32780

Richard T. Schultz, Media Services Coordinator

Henry Thomas, General Accounting Supervisor

Nora Aldrich, Internal Auditor

Mildred Archer, Accounting Specialist

Marilyn Rigerman, Cashier

Lori Cardinal, Secretary

Dorothy Geiser, Secretary

Judy Jacobs, Secretary

Dianne Jones, Secretary

Theresa Brieske, Clerk-typist

Lynn England, Secretary

Paul Brimer, Accounting Administrator

SUMMARY

YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION SEMINAR

The objective of the National Seminars on year-round education has been primarily to provide additional and up-dated information concerning alternatives to the traditional nine-month school year. The Third National Seminar had some additional objectives:

1. to question motives and methods relating to established and planned year-round programs;
2. to identify problem areas to help assure greater chance of success in future programs.

There is no question but that the primary objective of the Third National Seminar on Year-Round Education--that of providing information--was accomplished. The secondary objectives were accomplished to a slightly lesser degree, depending on the personal objectives of participants.

Participants generally indicated in their evaluations that their primary reason for attending this seminar was to "learn more" about year-round education. A few participants listed as their objective the study of curriculum as it relates to the extended school year. Still others came seeking techniques of implementation of a year-round program.

Participants were asked if they achieved their objectives, and to what degree. The response:

well achieved	50.5%
mostly achieved	15.8%
moderately achieved	30.8%
not achieved	1.8%

Participants were asked to rate information presented by speakers according to usefulness to them. They were asked to show whether it was extremely valuable, moderately valuable, of little value, or of no value, or did not attend.

Generally, the consultants' presentations were well received and were of some value. Only in a couple of instances were presentations rated of no value. These ratings came from a majority of people who heard the specific presentations.

Participants were asked what one speaker, general session, or special section was the most valuable feature. Of those responding, 65.4 per cent said the closing presentation on Wilson School was the most valuable feature. Others were rated ranging from 6 per cent down to 1 per cent. These were in order: Hayward-Valley View teams, Frank Brown, Fulton-Jefferson teams, mini-sessions, Wendell Pierce, Ned Hubbell, George Jensen, R. L. Johns, Jarvis Barnes, Alan O'Dell, Oz Johnson, Martin Rubinstein, Spear-Busard team and Wayne Worner.

Word of the highly successful Third National Seminar on Year-Round Education spread throughout the country. We filled many requests for copies of the Proceedings, and after the publication went out of print, turned down others.

Dr. Wayne H. White, superintendent in Brevard County, was appointed chairman of an ad hoc National Committee for Year-Round Education. The committee's responsibility is to develop recommendations for a permanent organization to serve as a national clearinghouse for information on the year-round school concept. Other members of the committee are George M. Jensen of Minneapolis, chairman of the National School Calendar Study Committee; John McLain, director of the Research-Learning Center at Clarion (Pa.) State College; Oz Johnson, assistant superintendent for research, Jefferson County (Ky.) School District; and Jack Price, San Diego County (Calif.) School District.

The San Diego (Calif.) Department of Education has already undertaken indepth planning for the Fourth National Seminar on Year-Round Education, scheduled in that city in February of next year.

Respectfully submitted,

D Weizenecker

R. DALE WEIZENECKER
Seminar Director

Van H. Savell

VAN H. SAVELL
Seminar Coordinator

Approved:

Wayne H. White

Wayne H. White, President
The National Seminar on
Year-Round Education, Inc.

Participants were also asked what session was lacking. About 9 per cent thought the second general session, "Why Year-Round Education Will Fail," was lacking becuase it was too lengthy. Other sessions or speakers were rated as lacking but by less than 2 per cent of the participants and primarily for personal reasons.

Participants were asked what suggestions they would make for conducting a Fourth National Seminar, and there were many excellent ideas presented, some of which we now know should have been incorporated into the Third National Seminar. These items are listed not necessarily in priority order:

1. The program should provide an opportunity for districts of small size to discuss year-round education together.
2. Use of panels with general session speakers should be more interspursed to back-up the program.
3. A catalyst such as B. Frank Brown should speak to all participants.
4. Mini-sessions should be utilized each day of the seminar with every participant having an opportunity to use several--the more the merrier.
5. Session meetings should be smaller.
6. Curriculum change should be discussed in greater depth.
7. Participants desire analysis of actual, on-going programs.
8. An opportunity for visitation to year-round concepts schools should be available.
9. Don Glines stimulating presentation should be followed-up with a report on what has happened at Wilson and Mankato State College.
10. Alan O'Dell should be utilized to a greater extent discussing the St. Charles project.
11. More question and answer sessions should be scheduled.
12. Participants wanted outlined to them the specific steps necessary to developing a feasibility study.
13. All possible consultants should be encouraged to utilized audio-visual techniques to a greater extent.
14. The oldtimers need additional time together. After a challenge such as that given by B. Frank Brown, they should have had an opportunity to rap together.

After having evaluated achievement of their own objectives, evaluated the consultants' presentations, rated the most valuable or least valuable features of the seminar, and made suggestions for future seminars, participants were asked in general how they rated the seminar.

excellent	50.5%
good	43.9%
fair	5.6%
poor	none

Participants' additional comments or suggestions dealt primarily with the details of any conference and are not necessary for this report.

THIRD NATIONAL SEMINAR ON YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION

Participants

Mr. Albert Adams, Bureau Chief
Teacher Education, Certification
and Accreditation
Florida Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Mr. John Aguire, Principal
Hialeah Junior High School
6028 East Seventh Avenue
Hialeah, Florida 33012

Mr. H. R. Alexander
3500 N. Orange
Sarasota, Florida 33580

Dr. James W. Anderson, Project Director
Minnesota Project on Differentiated Staffing
1712 Randolph Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55105

Mr. John Anderson
7330 Belle Glen
Houston, Texas 77072

Dr. Lyle E. Anderson, Jr.
481 Southwest 55 Terrace
Plantation, Florida 33314

Mr. Melvin Antrim
612 Walnut Street
West Des Moines, Iowa 50265

Mrs. Brenda Archibald
New York State Commission of
Elementary and Secondary Education
800 Second Avenue
New York, New York 10017

Mr. Ted Barker
Lakeview Middle School
Sanford, Florida 32771

Mr. Dick Barnett
Seminole High School
Sanford, Florida 32771

Dr. Robert J. Berry
Hartford Board of Education
249 High Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06118

Mr. Raymond H. Bassett
2024 E. Anderson Street
Orlando, Florida 32803

Mr.. C. Dale Baughman
120 Havermale Road
Farmersville, Ohio 45325

Mr. Nick Bazil
25501 Bryden Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44122

Mr. Jerry Beaver
5405 Carolyn Drive
Wilmington, North Carolina 28401

Mr. D. M. Bishop
Box 26
Monticello, Florida 32344

Mr. John A. Blank
Assistant Superintendent for
Elementary Education
Pinellas County Schools
P. O. Box 4688
Clearwater, Florida 33518

Mr. Dean B. Blankenship
Duval County School Board
Room 512, 330 East Bay Street
Jacksonville, Florida 32202

Mrs. Eve K. Booth
Director of Research
Volusia County Schools
Box 2118
DeLand, Florida 32720

Mr. R. L. Bradbury
1300 South Church Street
Jonesboro, Arkansas 72401

Mr. Milton Brantferger
617 N. Rainbow Drive
Hollywood, Florida 33021

Sister Brendan
Our Saviour's School
5301 N. Atlantic Ave.
Cocoa Beach, Florida 32931

Mr. Alex Bromir, Principal
Miami Springs Senior High School
751 Dove Avenue
Miami Springs, Florida 33166

Mrs. Jane Brooks
25501 Bryden Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44122

Mrs. Maryellen M. Brown
8700 Park Street
Vienna, Virginia 22180

Senator John R. Broxson
P. O. Box 160
Gulf Breeze, Florida

Mr. Guy Brunetti
Chicago Public Schools
228 N. LaSalle
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Mr. Sterling A. Bryant
925 Miccosukee Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32303

Mr. John N. Buch
Assistant County Superintendent
The Public Schools of Chester County
Market and New Streets
West Chester, Pennsylvania 19380

Mr. George W. Busby, Supervisor
Agriculture Education
Suite 116, 6880 Lake Ellenor Drive
Orlando, Florida 32809

Mr. Anthony Campagna
2110 Isabelle
San Mateo, California 94403

Mrs. Evelyn Carlson
Chicago Public Schools
400 E. Randolph Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Mr. Ernest B. Carnes
State Department of Education
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Mr. Walter N. Carroll
P. O. Box 6038
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23456

Miss Maude Carson
Chicago Public Schools
5941 N. Austin
Chicago, Illinois 60646

Dr. Angeline Caruso
Chicago Public Schools
1310 Ritchie Court
Chicago, Illinois 60610

Mr. Carlos E. Chardon
P. O. Box 21868, UPR Station
San Juan, Puerto Rico 00931

Mr. Chadwick C. Chase
Asst. Supt. of Schools
S. U. #27
Hudson, New Hampshire 03051

Mr. Owen Chastain
Asst. Supt. for Instruction
Putnam County Schools
P. O. Box 797
Palatka, Florida 32077

Mr. Peter A. Cheney
Yarmouth Intermediate School
Yarmouth, Maine 04096

Mr. Beecher E. Clapp
Director of Elementary Education
Knox County Board of Education
400 West Hill Avenue
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902

Mr. Charles E. Clear
Director of Educational Research Virginia
Virginia Department of Education
Richmond, Virginia 23216

Mrs. Harry W. Collison
550 Via Lugano
Winter Park, Florida 32789

Mr. John G. Colson, Jr.
Office of R & D
Prince William County Schools
P. O. Box 389
Manassas, Virginia 22110

Mr. Anthony Constanzo
116 Sunflower
San Antonio, Texas 78213

Dr. R. G. Cowgill
Florida Technological University
P. O. Box 25000
Orlando, Florida 32816

Mr. James R. Crawford
Moon Schools
1407 Beers School Road
Coraopolis, Pennsylvania 15108

Dr. Joseph W. Crenshaw, Bureau Chief
Curriculum and Instruction
Florida Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Mr. Robert D. Cummings
11802 Sharpview
Houston, Texas 77072

Mr. Neal Dahlen
2804 Brittan Avenue
San Carlos, California 94070

Mr. Joseph D'Andrea
329 McIntosh Drive
Coraopolis, Pennsylvania 15108

Mr. Oliver E. Daugherty, Bureau Chief
Planning and Coordination
Florida Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Mr. Francis L. Day
Howland Local Schools
8200 South, S. E.
Warren, Ohio 44484

Mr. Eugene C. Debus
Director of Instruction
Martin County
Box 1045
Stuart, Florida 33494

Mrs. Robert E. Deen
6003 Central Avenue
Tampa, Florida 33604

Mr. Thomas E. Deen
612 W. Broad Street
Brooksville, Florida 33512

Mr. Robert H. DeFord, Jr.
5124 Lobaugh Drive
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23456

Dr. Robert R. Denny
Asst. Supt. for Education
3026 S.W. 40th Street
Des Moines, Iowa 50321

Mr. W. H. DeShazo
District Office
Director of Secondary Education
Seminole County School Board
Sanford, Florida 33765

Dr. Samuel DeSimone
327 Lakewood Drive
Butler, Pennsylvania 16001

Mr. Justino Diaz-Morales
P. O. Box 21868
UPR Station
San Juan, Puerto Rico 00931

Mr. S. S. Dixon
301 West Highway #90 (Pace)
Milton, Florida 32570

Dr. W. B. Dribben
401 Howard Street
Greenwood, Mississippi 38930

Mr. Joseph H. Elliott
Clay High School
Green Cove Springs, Florida 32043

Mr. Bernard J. Ellis
Superintendent of Schools
23 South Main Street
Derry, New Hampshire 03038

Mr. Edward Feeny
Public School System
Prince George's County
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20870

Mr. Gaylord Feick, Director
Office of Federal Program Development
Port Huron Area School District
509 Stanton Street
Port Huron, Michigan 48060

Mr. Ron Ferrer
Teacher Special Assignment
Dade County Public Schools
1410 N.E. 2nd Avenue
Miami, Florida 33132

Mrs. Joan Fitzgerald
75 East Ridge Court
Pacifica, California 94403

Mr. Hugh C. Flanders
Asst. Supt. of Supportive Services
School Board of Lee County
School Board Annex
2235 First Street
Ft. Myers, Florida 33901

Mr. Paul M. Folan
14 Sheridan Street
Portland, Maine 04101

Mr. Gene Fox
Prince William County Schools
P. O. Box 389
Manassas, Virginia 22110

Mr. Bill Friedman
General Consultant
P. O. Box 702
Tavares, Florida 32778

Dr. Robert T. Frossard
280 Norman Hall
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Mr. Ralph L. Frost
Route 4, Box 4070
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23457

Mr. James Gearhart
Box 471
Wrightsville Beach,
North Carolina 28480

Dr. James Gemmell
Clarion State College
Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214

Mr. William E. George
P. O. Box 2648
Vero Beach, Florida 32960

Mr. G. J. Gholson
Asst. for Administration
Prince George's County Public Schools
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20870

Mr. George M. Gibbs, Principal
Fairfax County Public Schools
Fairfax, Virginia 22301

Mr. Herbert D. Gibbs, Jr.
509 Burcham Drive
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Mr. Harley Gilmore
Box 461
New Port Richey, Florida 33552

Mr. Martin T. Green
2125 Jackson Bluff Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Mr. William D. Grindeland
5206 Lilac Lane
Racine, Wisconsin 53406

Mrs. Mary Groome
Director of Elementary Education
Seminole County School Board
Sanford, Florida 32771

Dr. Ann Grooms, President
Educational Services Institute, Inc.
Museum Building, Suite 200
3015 Plainville Road
Cincinnati, Ohio 45227

Senator Freeman Hankins
c/o Dr. John McLain
Clarion State College
Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214

Dr. Joseph Hannon
Chicago Public Schools
228 N. LaSalle
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Mr. Alan E. Hart
Box 509
Perry, Florida 32347

Mr. Robert L. Hartzell
Box 936
New Port Richey, Florida 33552

Mr. Alan Harvey
P. O. Box 794
Macclenny, Florida 32063

Mr. Rodney Hatch
Charleston,
Maine 04422

Mr. Ellis Hawkins
School Board Member
Prince William County Schools
P. O. Box 389
Manassas, Virginia 22110

Mr. William Heinicke
1610 N. Columbia
Seward, Nebraska 68434

Mr. Benjamin D. Hengst
Bureau of Administrative
Leadership Services
Pennsylvania Dept. of Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Dr. David E. Hernandez
Florida Technological University
College of Education
P. O. Box 25000
Orlando, Florida 32816

Dr. James Higginbotham
Superintendent of Schools
Orange County School Board
P. O. Box 271
Orlando, Florida 32802

Mr. William Hilliard, Principal
Crystal River High School
1205 N.E. 8th Avenue
Crystal River, Florida 32629

Dr. C. E. Holladay
P. O. Box 557
Tupelo, Mississippi 38801

Mr. H. G. Hollingsworth, Jr.
South Carolina State Dept. of Education
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Mrs. Thelma W. Horacek
National Education Association
1201 16th Street N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Mr. Frank Iverson
Box BV
Agana, Guam 96910

Mr. Garland E. Jackson
P. O. Box 6038
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23456

Mr. Link Jarrett
Dept. of Administration
Bureau of Planning
Clemans Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32303

Mr. Paul Jarvinen
202 Central Street
Rockland, Massachusetts 02370

Mrs. Virginia Jeffers
Pennsylvania School Board Assoc.
410 N. Third Street
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Mr. J. Ernest Johnson
Pennsylvania Dept. of Education
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Mr. Robert B. Johnson
P. O. Box 687
Fernandina Beach, Florida 32034

Mr. Myron Jones
Supv. of Maintenance
Prince William County Schools
P. O. Box 389
Manassas, Virginia 22110

Mr. Jack Jordan
5900 Evers Road
San Antonio, Texas 78229

Dr. John E. Justus, Assistant Chief
Bureau of School Facilities
Florida Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Mr. Dean Kells, Director
Curriculum Services
Marion County School Board
Box 670
Ocala, Florida 32670

Mr. Kenneth Kibler
Valley View School District #96
Dalhart Avenue
Lockport, Illinois 60441

Mrs. Kenneth Kibler
Valley View School District #96
Dalhart Avenue
Lockport, Illinois 60441

Dr. Curtis Killough
Asst. Supt. for Instruction
and Curriculum Development
Escambia County School Board
P. O. Box 1470
Pensacola, Florida 32502

Mr. Don Killough
13328 Trail Hollow
Houston, Texas 77024

Mr. Leon A. King
704 W. Emma
Tampa, Florida 33603

Mr. William H. Knight
800 Magnolia Avenue
Piedmont, California 94611

Mr. William H. Koenig
Asst. Superintendent
Grove City Area School District
Highland Avenue
Grove City, Pennsylvania 16127

Dr. Harry A. Koss
Lee County School District
County Courthouse
Ft. Myers, Florida 33901

Mr. Donald G. Kremer
521 Westover
Oconomowoc, Wisconsin 53066

Mr. Tom Krepel
724 S. 11th Street
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Mr. Lucian Lambert
Champlain Valley Union High School
Hinesburg, Vermont 06481

Mr. Carl Lancaster
Prince George's County Public Schools
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20870

Mr. Lawrence M. Large
Manheim Township School District
Neffsville, Pennsylvania 17556

Mr. Blaine J. Lemmon
Hillsdale High School
San Mateo, California 94403

Mr. Alphonso Levy
County Music Coordinator
Columbia County School Board
Rt. 1, Box 128
Lake City, Florida 32055

Dr. Solomon Lichter, Principal
Miami Beach Senior High School
2231 Prairie Avenue
Miami Beach, Florida 33139

Mr. John W. Maddox
Hardee Educational Center
1001 N. 6th Avenue
Wauchula, Florida 33873

Mr. H. James Mahan
24601 Fairmount Blvd.
Cleveland, Ohio 44124

Mr. John Marmillo
c/o Gabriel F. Ponte
Van Wick Junior High School
Wappingers Falls, New York 12590

Mr. Ralph Martin
Room 304, Pascoe County Courthouse
Dade City, Florida 33525

Mr. Robert B. McCarter
1225 Dogwood Drive
West Chester, Pennsylvania 19380

Dr. Stanley McClintic
Grossmont Union High School District
P. O. Box 1043
La Mesa, California 92041

Mr. J. Bruce McKenna
Salem School District
Main Street
Salem, New Hampshire 03079

Mr. Don Means
Research-Learning Center
Clarion State College
Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214

Mr. Joseph E. Millard
112-116 Eleventh Street
Des Moines, Iowa 50309

Dr. C. C. Miller
Florida Technological University
College of Education
P. O. Box 25000
Orlando, Florida 32816

Mrs. Eleanor Miller
P. O. Box 797
Palatka, Florida 32077

Dr. Richard D. Miller, Supt.
East Allen County Schools
1240 U. S. 30 East
New Haven, Indiana 46774

Mr. Leon E. Milton
Box 793
Dade City, Florida 32535

Dr. Thomas J. Moffett
Orange County School Board
P. O. Box 271
Orlando, Florida 32802

Mr. George E. Molnar
Lake County School Board
201 W. Burleigh Blvd.
Tavares, Florida 32778

Mr. J. A. Moore
Knott Building
Florida Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Mr. Russell Mosely
Dept. of Public Instruction
126 Langdon Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Dr. Roger Mott
Escambia County School Board
P. O. Box 1470
Pensacola, Florida 32502

Mr. James Mounie
Research & Curriculum Specialist
School Board of the City of Virginia Beach
P. O. Box 6038
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23456

Dr. Ernest Mueller
School-Community Relations
P. O. Box 389
Manassas, Virginia 22110

Mr. Robert Muscio
Lakeside Union School District
P. O. Box 578
Lakeside, California 92040

Mr. Donald J. Nelson, Principal
Arlington High School
Poughkeepsie, New York 12603

Mrs. June Niswonger
Madison Township School District
444 S. Broadway
Trotwood, Ohio 45426

Mr. Robert Norfleet
16W611 Hillside Lane
Hinsdale, Illinois 60521

Mr. John E. O'Dowd, Jr.
731 St. Charles Avenue
New Orleans, Louisiana 70130

Mr. Charles E. Oswalt
37 Berrywood Drive
Belleville, Illinois 62223

Mr. John L. Owen
Wellsville,
Utah, 84339

Mrs. Dolores Parrott
Hernando County School Board
612 W. Broad Street
Brooksville, Florida 33512

Dr. David Pascoe
La Mesa-Spring Valley School District
P. O. Box 457
La Mesa, California 92041

Mrs. Mildred Patterson
Admin. Assistant
Knox County Board of Education
400 West Hill Avenue
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902

Mr. E. Raymond Peterson
Assistant Commissioner-Instruction
State Dept. of Education
Centennial Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Mr. Larry Pinco
State Dept. of Education
Augusta, Maine 04330

Mr. Robert Pobuda
525 Coutant Street
Flushing, Michigan 48433

Mr. Gabriel F. Ponte
Van Wike Junior High School
Wappingers Falls, New York 12590

Mr. Arthur D. Powers, Sr.
School Board Member
45 Palmer
St. Augustine, Florida 32084

Mr. Richard Prater
Spring Lake Elementary School
Altamonte Springs, Florida 32701

Dr. Jack Price
San Diego County Dept. of Education
6401 Linda Vista Road
San Diego, California 92111

Mr. J. W. Pritchard, Supervisor
Educational Research and Testing
1402 Lewis
Des Moines, Iowa 50315

Mr. William D. Purcell
18 Felton Street
Hudson, Massachusetts 01749

Mrs. Jean Purvis
515 N. McKean Street
Butler, Pennsylvania 16001

Mr. A. Cyril Ramsey
3700 Seventh Avenue
Altoona, Pennsylvania 16602

Mr. Marl Ramsey
112-116 Eleventh Street
Des Moines, Iowa 50309

Mr. W. W. Read
P. O. Box 391
Bartow, Florida 33830

Dr. Francis A. Rhodes
Florida Public School Council
Dept. of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Dr. Charles H. Richards
1401 Havana Avenue
Ft. Pierce, Florida 33450

Mr. Robert Richards
Westbrook High School
125 Stroudwater Street
Westbrook, Maine 04092

Mr. Ronald B. Riegel
818 Sycamore
Belleville, Illinois 62221

Mr. John Ritter
Florida Department of Education
Knott Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Mr. Max M. Robbins
DuPre Drive
Spartanburg, South Carolina 29302

Dr. Joseph P. Roberts
Virginia Dept. of Education
Richmond, Virginia 23216

Mr. O. D. Roberts
925 Miccosukee road
Tallahassee, Florida 32303

Mrs. Maralyn Robinson
5303 Valley Trail
Racine, Wisconsin 53402

Dr. John W. Rogers
Supt. of Schools
34 Goddard Avenue
Rockland, Massachusetts 02370

Mr. Robert Rousseau
School Board Member
Prince William County Public Schools
P. O. Box 389
Manassas, Virginia 22110

Mr. Donald Rowe
3625 Kinzie Avenue
Racine, Wisconsin 53405

Mr. Wayne R. Samuelson
5508 Lindsey Terrace
Lincoln, Nebraska 68524

Mr. Thomas E. Sanders
Mt. Dora High School
Mt. Dora, Florida 32757

Mr. Oliver J. Sands, Jr.
2209 East Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia 23223

Mr. Harold E. Schnell
430 E. Pease Avenue
West Carrollton, Ohio 45449

Mr. Burke B. Scisson
General Consultant
Florida Dept. of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Dr. Leonard Servetter
Chula Vista City Schools
P.O. Box 907
Chula Vista, California 92012

Mr. Daniel Shaheen
Dept. Supv. and Curriculum Development
Montgomery County Schools
850 N. Washington Street
Rockville, Maryland 20851

Mr. Leon Shimer
Box 500
St. Augustine, Florida 32084

Mr. Ronald L. Shimer
522 Genesee N.E.
Warren, Ohio 44483

Mr. John Simon
6800 High Street
Worthington, Ohio 43085

Mr. Charles E. Sims
301 Hurricane Drive
Jonesboro, Arkansas 72401

Mr. Bruce Sivertsen
850 N. Washington Street
Rockville, Maryland 20851

Mrs. Freda S. Skirvin
7509 Magarity Road
Falls Church, Virginia 22043

Mr. Joe J. Slaven
Fayetteville Public Schools
P. O. Box 849
Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701

Mrs. Barbara I. Smith
6101 Mass Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20016

Mr. W. Eugene Smith
State Dept. of Education
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Mr. William H. Smith
213 Woodland Road
Butler, Pennsylvania 16001

Mr. Dick Snell
612 Walnut Street
West Des Moines, Iowa 50265

Mr. John P. Sprinkle
Director of Secondary Education
Corpus Christi Public Schools
P. O. Box 110
Corpus Christi, Texas 78403

Mr. Jay B. Starkey, Jr.
Box 22
Odessa, Florida 33556

Mrs. Ione Stewart
505 Laurel Valley Road
Austin, Texas 78746

Dr. Lorraine Sullivan
Chicago Public Schools
400 E. Randolph St.
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Mr. Sal Susi, Principal
Special Assignment
Dade County Public Schools
1410 N.E. 2nd Avenue
Miami, Florida 33132

Mr. Robert R. Tabor, Principal
Fairfax High School
10675 Lee Highway
Fairfax, Virginia 22030

Mr. Joseph Tekerman, Principal
Miami Jackson Senior High School
1751 N.W. 36th Street
Miami, Florida 32125

Mr. Richard G. Tennessen
Box DE
Agana, Guam 96910

Mr. Joseph H. Theissen
604 So. 3rd Street
Stillwater, Minnesota 55082

Mr. Edward Thomas
Prince William County Schools
P. O. Box 389
Manassas, Virginia 22110

Mr. Herbert Thomas
Howland High School
200 Shaffer Drive
Warren, Ohio 44484

Mr. Frank Thompson
Chicago Public Schools
228 N. LaSalle
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Mr. Howard A. Thompson, Supt.
Warren County School District
P. O. Box 186
Warren, Pennsylvania 16365

Mr. Joseph A. Tosti
Asst. Division Superintendent
P. O. Box 389
Manassas, Virginia 22110

Mrs. Beverly Traub
Hernando County School Board
612 W. Broad Street
Brooksville, Florida 33512

Mr. David Tressler
204 Bluegrass Drive
Butler, Pennsylvania 16001

Mr. Paul Turk
Education Writer
Journal Herald
Dayton, Ohio 45405

Mr. Ray Turner, Principal
Palmetto Junior High School
7351 S.W. 128th Street
Miami, Florida 33156

Dr. Dwight Twist
San Diego Unified School District
4100 Normal
San Diego, California 92103

Mr. Lee Tyler
1303 Chinook Trail
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Mr. Stephen M. Vargo
Dept. of Evaluation,
Research and Planning
Columbus Public Schools
52 S. Starling Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Dr. William A. Volk
Office of R & D
Prince William County Schools
P. O. Box 389
Manassas, Virginia 22110

Mr. M. D. Walker, Supt.
Gadsden County Board of
Public Instruction
Quincy, Florida 32351

Mr. Kenneth Watson
4910 62nd Avenue
St. Petersburg, Florida 33710

Mr. Gordon Wegner
1792 Park Lake Drive
Boulder, Colorado 80301

Mr. Russell Wheatley, Principal
Henry H. Filer Junior High School
531 W. 29th Street
Hialeah, Florida 33012

Dr. David G. Wheeler
4802 Walter Street
Belleville, Illinois 62221

Mr. William Whitten, Coordinator
Data, Management and Publications
Florida Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Dr. David Willey, Supt.
Franklin McKinley Schools
400 Tully Road
San Jose, California 95112

Dr. Emmett L. Williams
140 Normal Hall
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Mr. Lerue Winget, Deputy Supt.
Utah State Board of Education
1400 University Club Building
136 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Mr. James M. Wolfe
Howland Local Schools
8200 South, S. E.
Warren, Ohio 44484

Mr. James H. Wooldridge, Supt.
Madison Township School District
444 S. Broadway
Trotwood, Ohio 45426

Mr. Victor V. Zike
Asst. Dir. of Instruction, Secondary
Penn Hills School District
12200 Garland Drive
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15235

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

We would appreciate your cooperation in filling out the following evaluation questionnaire. Your reaction and responses to this year's Seminar will be very valuable in the planning for future seminars. No signature is necessary. Return your reply to the Seminar Office before noon Friday.

1. Please state your primary objective at the Seminar. ______________________________

____

2. Was this objective largely achieved through your participation in the Seminar?

☐ well achieved ☐ mostly achieved
☐ moderately achieved ☐ not achieved

3. Please rate information presented by speakers according to usefulness to you.

A (extremely valuable) B (moderately valuable) C (of little value)
D (of no value) E (did not attend)

- ☐ George M. Jensen
- ☐ George Glinke
- ☐ Oz Johnson
- ☐ B. Frank Brown
- ☐ Jarvis Barnes
- ☐ Ruth Duncan
- ☐ R. L. Johns
- ☐ Ned S. Hubbell
- ☐ Benjamin C. Willis
- ☐ Martin Rubinstein
- ☐ Wayne M. Worner
- ☐ Glen H. Penner
- ☐ Alan M. O'Dell
- ☐ Raymond Spear--Earl Busard
- ☐ Andrew S. Adams
- ☐ C. M. Clark
- ☐ Thomas J. Moe
- ☐ Sami J. Alam
- ☐ Thomas E. Putnam
- ☐ John Seay
- ☐ Wendell H. Pierce
- ☐ Paul D. West
- ☐ Richard VanHoose
- ☐ Fulton County team
- ☐ Jefferson County team
- ☐ Robert Williams
- ☐ Kenneth Hermansen
- ☐ Hayward team
- ☐ Valley View team
- ☐ Pennsylvania team
- ☐ Don Glines

4. What one speaker, general session, or special section of the entire Seminar program do you rate above all others as being the most valuable feature?

____

5. What session was lacking, if any, in your opinion?

____

6. What suggestions would you make for the Fourth National Seminar if such is conducted?

____

7. In general, how do you rate this Seminar?

☐ excellent ☐ good ☐ fair ☐ poor

8. Please make any other comments or suggestions which you think would assist in planning future seminars?

____

____

____